This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

UNIVERSALISM

EXAMINED, RENOUNCED, EXPOSED;

IN

A SERIES OF LECTURES,

EMBRACING

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE AUTHOR DURING A MINISTRY OF TWELVE YEARS,

AND

THE TESTIMONY OF UNIVERSALIST MINISTERS TO THE DREADFUL MORAL TENDENCY OF THEIR FAITH.

BY

MATTHEW HALE SMITH

SIXTH EDITION.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY TAPPAN & DENNET.
NEW YORK: MARK H. NEWMAN; SAXTON & MILES
PHILADELPHIA: PERKINS & PURVES.

1843.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842, by
MATTHEW HALE SMITH,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

STEREOTYPED AT THE
BOSTON TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY.

2504
50

BX
9947
.S6
1843

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

PAGE.

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE, ... 1

LECTURE II.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, ARISING FROM THE DIFFICULTIES THAT ATTEND ITS DEFENCE, ... 55

LECTURE III.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM THE THREATENINGS OF THE BIBLE, ... 88

LECTURE IV.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM THE ARGUMENTS ADDUCED IN SUPPORT OF THE DOCTRINE, ... 148

LECTURE V.

UNIVERSALISM NOT SUSTAINED BY THE ARGUMENTS IN ITS FAVOR DERIVED FROM THE LIGHT OF NATURE, ... 177

LECTURE VI.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM ITS *MORAL RESULTS*, ... 214

LECTURE VII.

ARGUMENT AGAINST UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM FUTURE JUDGMENT, ... 3

ADDRESS TO CHRISTIANS,

IN RELATION TO UNIVERSALISTS AND UNIVERSALISM, 3

LECTURE I.

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

PSALM lxvi. 16.

COME AND HEAR, ALL YE THAT FEAR GOD, AND I WILL DECLARE WHAT HE HATH DONE FOR MY SOUL.

In these words of the monarch David, there is a singular and a beautiful propriety. On matters belonging to his kingdom, he would have called for his national council. On subjects of taste or refinement, he would have invited the gifted and cultivated to his presence-chamber. But when he spoke of the dealings of God with himself, the influence and operation of the Holy Spirit upon and within his own soul, he sought the society, the sympathy, and attention, of those who feared God. Monarch though he was, he was not ashamed to own the work of God upon his soul. Surrounded by the great, and encompassed with all the splendor that ever shone upon an Eastern throne, he could so far forget his princely position, as to call upon some of the humblest in the land to come and hear what God had done for his soul. For those only who feared God, could sympathize with his anguish, appreciate the distress through which he had

passed, or share the deliverance and rapture which God had wrought in his soul.

I have thought these words appropriate to my own case, and to this occasion. If my soul has been transformed, and my heart renewed, God has done it. If my feet have been taken from the way of death, — if my work is changed from leading souls to ruin, to turning them into the path of life, — the glory belongs to God. And if I shall ever be of any service in the kingdom of God's dear Son, and shine at last with those who have turned many to righteousness, the Holy Ghost has been the agent, by whom it has been effected. Why, then, should I not turn and give the glory to God?

And to whom shall I speak of what God has done for my soul, if not to those who fear God? Were the theme of my discourse pleasure, vanity, or sensuality, I should call upon the lovers of pleasure more than of God, the sons and daughters of vanity, and the slaves of sensuality, to hear me; and I should address them upon a theme, and in language, they could well understand. But my single purpose now is to magnify the grace of God in the salvation of my soul; to tell what God has done for me; to show you the way in which the Lord has led me, in bringing me up from death to life. Many have no faith in the saving of the soul by the Holy Ghost. Many regard the operation of God's truth upon the heart, as a work that exists only in the imagination. In respect to such a change, by such an agency, the scoffer lifts a bold, *blaspheming* voice. To speak to such, to ask them

to come and hear what God has done for my soul, would be folly. Few would be disposed to hear what they do not understand; and of that few, the most, having prejudged the case, would "speak evil of the things that they understood not." To those, then, who fear God, I must speak, if I would have my subject appreciated; though all may feel interest enough to bestow a respectful attention upon this lecture.

The design of the course of lectures, of which this is the first, is to present the reasons which have led me from Universalism, and induced me to leave a ministry to which I have devoted twelve years of the best part of my life. In doing this, I respond to the call of the defenders of Universalism, and perform a work which they have professed themselves earnestly desirous to have performed. They invite, nay, challenge inquiry. They are confident that Universalism is opposed because it is not understood; they complain that their expositions of Scripture are unnoticed; that their arguments in defence of Universalism are either not examined at all, or lightly passed over; that doctrines are attributed to them, which they have never received, and which they disavow; and that those who speak of the moral tendency of Universalism know not of what they affirm.

My acquaintance with Universalism enables me to speak advisedly in relation to its practical tendency. An experience of years with the system and its friends, a settlement over one of the largest congregations of Universalists in the country, and an extensive acquaintance with the preachers of the

system in all parts of the country, fit me to bear an intelligent testimony as to that system, and to state what I know and have seen.

In discoursing upon Universalism, I presume to speak as one familiar with my subject. Its doctrines I learned in childhood. Its arguments I wielded while I had confidence in them; and only resigned them when I was convinced that they were unsound. Its moral tendency I know too well; its influence upon man, and the best good of man, I have repeatedly seen. And it is but just to say that its results are uniform; one tendency distinguishes it; it bears one kind of fruit; it every where is peculiar for one sort of influence; and is ever characterized by the same results. Describe its triumphs in one place, and you describe them in all. Exhibit its tendency in one case, and you have a picture of the system every where.

I feel most forcibly the peculiar circumstances under which I speak. I am expected to exhibit reasons which have led me from a defence of, and a belief in, Universalism. My doubts touching the truth of Universalism were not of my own seeking. They came unbidden, and were unwelcome. I had no desire to leave Universalism. It was bound up with my earliest associations. Nearly all my relations and acquaintances were of that faith. For it I felt the highest attachment, and my desire was to live in its defence, and die in its embrace. And I cannot describe my wretchedness when I found myself surrounded with doubts, and my system opposed by difficulties, that I could not remove. Against my

wish, I was compelled to listen to those difficulties and objections. And when I sat down to remove them, I arose from my work convinced that the attempt had only added to the number, and increased my labor.

This to me was a source of very great anxiety and trouble. Conflicts before unknown assailed me. Distrust, fear, and perplexity, multiplied on each side, and well nigh overcame me. And when I finally abandoned Universalism, the step was not a hasty one. The conflict cost me almost my life. Nor was it for want of determination or desire on my part, that these difficulties were not removed, and my mind set forever at rest on my former faith. But no relief or comfort could I gain until my refuge of lies was abandoned, and I, as a penitent, sought, and, as I trust, obtained, mercy at the foot of the cross of Christ.

In this course of lectures I shall lay before you this whole process. I hope to do all this work in a kind spirit. It has been my prayer to my Savior, that nothing may appear in these lectures which shall exhibit any spirit save that which he will own and bless. While I speak plainly, I wish to do it kindly. And while the only severity that will appear will be the severity of truth, I desire to "speak the truth in love." I have no animosities to revenge, no passion to gratify. I bear Universalists no hatred. I leave behind me many persons whom I would most gladly take away from a system to which they and I have been too long and too fondly attached. I believe them to be attached to a ruinous error, to a fatal delusion; as fatal to the soul as the deadliest

poison is to the body; that the way in which they walk, though it seemeth right to them, is the way of destruction—"the end thereof is death." I believe the whole tendency of Universalism to be baleful in the extreme to the best interests of our race, and that its ministry is engaged in the ruin of souls, and everywhere is stained with their blood. I speak from the character which my own labors have borne in that cause, and from my knowledge of the results of Universalism. My reasons for these opinions I shall lay before you. I have no learned essay to present. I design to meet Universalism as it is; to give you the result of my own sad experience upon this subject, and to say a few plain things in a plain way; to prove that Universalism has no claim upon any rational mind; to set forth the withering power of error; to lift a warning voice, and bid all, not yet insnared, to shun a delusion, which, with a siren song, and with assurance of safety, leads down to everlasting despair all who trust its teaching.

The present lecture, consisting of a mere recital of my own feelings, experience, and investigation upon Universalism, demands, perhaps, an apology for introducing it. Indeed, did I consult my own feelings, I should strike this lecture from my course. It is not pleasant thus to speak of myself, to recall harrowing and painful scenes. Nor do I attach importance enough to my personal feelings, to give them the prominence which they hold in this lecture. But my friends, in whose judgment I place more confidence than in my own, have urged me not to omit it, as it seems desirable that the process

should accompany the result. I have been induced to waive all considerations of a personal character, to hush all suggestions arising from considerations of delicacy, and at once approach the subject of this lecture, — MY RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

MY EARLY LIFE.

Those who have enjoyed early religious instruction, who in youth have been counselled, and in early life have been taught, of God; who have grown up under impressions made around the family altar, and have all their life been followed by religious influences, — can poorly sympathize with me. I never enjoyed early religious instruction. In my father's house there was no family altar; no voice of prayer was there heard; no reading of the Bible as an act of worship. I never enjoyed the benefit of Sabbath school instruction; no friend told me of God; no one instructed me to lisp his name, or fear his law. I have no recollection of having ever passed a night in my life, till I was more than twenty years of age, in a house in which there was family prayer, or the reading of the Bible, as an act of religious worship.

My earliest recollections as to religion are identified with Universalism. My first impressions upon the subject are very distinct at this hour. I thought the gospel was designed simply to teach that men would not be damned; that, however men died, God would make all equally happy at death; that the Bible, beside this, taught little else that was important or interesting, and, on the whole, was rather a dull

book. The Sabbath I was taught to regard as a day of rest from toil, but not from sport; and no one who had influence upon my childhood interposed any restraint from my doing my own pleasure upon the holy Sabbath. When I was six years of age, my father embraced the doctrine of Universalism, and became a preacher of the system. Nearly all that I heard upon the subject of religion, was favorable to Universalism; nearly all my relatives were of that faith; and almost all my acquaintances received the same sentiments. Very early I imbibed a hatred toward all systems that differed from this. So soon were the seeds of error planted in my heart — seeds watered by impure counsels and hurtful instructions.

FIRST SERIOUS IMPRESSIONS.

When I arrived at the age of sixteen years, my attention was turned to the subject of personal religion. A seriousness prevailed among many of my associates, the influence of which I felt. Religion seemed to me a great concern. I thought that my life was not what it should be, and that, to be respected, I must change my associates. I knew that my heart was not right in the sight of God, and that to die as I then was, would expose me to the wrath of God. My feelings were enlisted and changed. I read the Bible with pleasure, and, in some small meetings, urged my fellow-men to repentance.

But it was my misfortune to be thrown among a class of professors who belonged to no Christian *denomination*. They stood alone as a church; and,

though they held to experimental religion, they rejected nearly all of the essential doctrines of the gospel. They denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, the immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of endless punishment. Though my feelings were excited upon the theme of religion, my understanding was not informed. I had no settled religious opinions. The amount of my faith was this: I believed the Bible to be an inspired book; that Jesus Christ was a man; and that annihilation was the doom of the finally impenitent.

At this time, I was thrown into the company of Universalists, and their system was commended to my attention. I was invited and persuaded to attend their meetings, and was assured that Universalism and personal piety could harmonize, and that one would be the better Christian, the more devoted man, for receiving that faith. I found the advocates of Universalism frequently using terms which others employed in connection with religious truth; and, presuming them to be sincere, I found myself growing daily in favor of Universalism. I examined the arguments by which it was supported; became familiar with the exposition given to difficult parts of the Bible; and as my early associations favored the claims of Universalism, I adopted the system when in my seventeenth year. Believing that Universalism could do for man what no other system could, I resolved to enter its ministry. I made vigorous preparations for the public advocacy of my faith; and my first sermon was preached in Medway, Massachusetts, in the month

of August, 1828; at which time I was seventeen years and ten months old.

FIRST SETTLEMENT.

In the month of December, 1829, I removed to Vermont, to take charge of two Universalist societies; the one being situated in Brattleboro', the other in Guilford. Having the most unbounded confidence in my system, I had no doubt that it would work a great moral change in men, and soon cause the wilderness to blossom as the rose. I used every exertion to spread Universalism; and preached with all the ardor of youth, and the fervor of sincerity. Universalism was the only system that I ever embraced till my present views were adopted. By Universalists I was ordained; and never was my name enrolled among any other sect as a preacher, till my present connections were formed, in January, 1841.

At the very outset, I was mortified at the results of my ministry, and pained with what I saw in those who were the loudest in their professions of regard for "the blessed doctrine," as Universalism was usually called. I saw none of that reform which I expected would attend my preaching; no moral reformation, though none needed it more than my personal friends; no change for the better, though I saw many changes for the worse. Indeed, the practical tendencies of my preaching were not what I had expected to see. They were not what I saw attending the preaching of the gospel in the very vicinity in which I labored. I was

praised in the bar-rooms, and my health drank in almost every tavern in the county. On the Sabbath, my congregation came direct from the tavern to my meeting, and went as directly back to the tavern after the meeting. The intermission was usually passed in discussing the merits of the sermon, not always in the most decorous terms; and in drinking my health, with their best wishes for my successful vindication of the salvation of all men. These meetings were a source of no mean profit to tavern-keepers in both towns in which I preached; and one of them, though not a Universalist, avowed himself to be "a liberal man," and contributed something to keep our meetings along.

The opposers of Universalism, who were made sad at my success, who trembled for the rising generation, and prayed that such sentiments might not prevail, I considered to be a bigoted and illiberal class of men. Yet I was compelled to allow that they embraced the sober, the intelligent, the religious portion of the community, — that class of self-sacrificing men who upheld the sacred altar, kept the Sabbath holy, and feared God.

While those who attended upon my ministry were called the liberal party, I knew that most of them were profane men; a large portion were open disbelievers in the inspiration of the Bible; and nearly all had been peculiar for their habits of Sabbath violation, passing the day in business or in pleasure. In all things save an attendance upon my preaching, they remained professedly and really the same. Men came together, but *not* to be made better. They

seemed to desire that their hands might be strengthened in sin; and thought the end of preaching to be, to prove that all retribution was limited to this life, and that all men would finally be saved. When occasionally I urged upon my hearers the duties of life, and lightly reproved their vices, I was told that such preaching was decidedly illiberal, and very much like the Orthodox. Nor were profaneness, gambling, Sabbath-breaking, or infidelity, regarded as in any respect inconsistent with a profession of Universalism. One of the officers of my society in Guilford, was in the habit of going into the adjoining towns to hear me preach; and I have known him repeatedly to pass nearly the whole of Saturday night in gambling with young men at a tavern—young men whom he had invited to accompany him to meeting. And at the same time, this individual was engaged in a controversy in a secular paper with a Methodist clergyman, upon the moral tendency of Universalism!

I was very much troubled by these considerations. My labors were not attended with the good results which I desired, and which I knew ought to follow a system of truth. One uniform tendency accompanied Universalism in all places. One class of men hailed the doctrine, and wished the preacher abundant success. Whenever called to preach in a place which I had never visited, I knew what the character of my congregation would be before I saw it. Often have I been complimented with oaths; heard the scoffer and the vile hope the good work would go on; and been wished success in language too foul and *offensive to be* repeated. When I saw a man in my

congregation of an intelligent appearance, I presumed him to be an infidel, and never in this respect was mistaken.

I never supposed that religion was given to make men worse; nor to exert the negative influence of not doing any harm. That it was sent to make men better, and do for them what nothing else could do, I was convinced. That such reformations as I desired to see, did follow the preaching of the Savior and the apostles, and now attended the preaching of doctrines different from my own, I could not deny. How, then, could my faith be correct, and yet be followed by such fruits? For what purpose was a system, marked by such tendencies as mine, sent from heaven? Often, in the solitude of my study, such questions, searching and painful, would arise. A still, small voice would seem to inquire, "Does good attend your labors? Are men made better by them? Do profaneness, Sabbath-breaking, intemperance, licentiousness, fly at the approach of your faith, and cease when it spreads? Do religious fear, godliness, holiness, distinguish its reception among men? What good are you accomplishing? Who is made happier or better by your ministry?" These reflections troubled me, and made me unhappy. But they did not shake my faith in my system. I thought that to be good, but men to be bad. I consoled myself with the reflection, that the fault was in the professors of Universalism, and not in the system.

With such feelings I attended the Franklin Association of Universalists which met in Chesterfield, N. H., in the month of August, 1831. A minister

from New York preached what I then thought to be one of the greatest sermons I had ever heard. His avowed object was to clear Universalism from the charge of being a licentious system. The sermon was a word in season to me. It met my case, removed my difficulties, and enabled me to account for the moral results of my faith without calling its truth in question.

The argument of the sermon was this: — Love fulfils the law of God; and all men actuated by love will be obedient and happy — all who do evil are not under the influence of love, for love worketh no ill to his neighbor. From this the preacher drew the conclusion that Universalism is love; its preaching must be beneficial; and if men are immoral who profess that faith, it is because they do not practise what they profess. I thought the argument to be conclusive, and felt great joy that my difficulty was removed. I thought that the great hinderance to my defending the faith with satisfaction was now easily and forever taken out of the way.

But my joy was of short continuance. I left the meeting-house with two ministers; both of whom had preached Universalism many years, and are now among its most popular advocates. I mentioned to them the satisfaction I derived from the sermon. One of them replied, "But the argument is sophistical. The real objection has not been removed, nor touched; and Mr. S. knew it. No one doubts but love will do all that he says it will. But the point to be proved is this: Does the preaching of Universalism produce *this love*? And that point the preacher has evaded."

His words fell on my ear with power. My difficulties returned with sevenfold force. And with them came the consciousness that my associates had not so much confidence in Universalism, as they gave their hearers reason to believe they had. And when, a few years afterwards, I heard this preacher use the same argument in defence of Universalism which he had pronounced sophistical, I had great difficulty in believing him to be sincere in the defence of his avowed faith.

REMOVAL TO HARTFORD, CONN.

In the year 1832, I accepted an invitation to remove to Hartford, Connecticut, and take charge of the Universalist society in that place. My labors were successful, so far as securing a large congregation was concerned. For me my society professed a great regard; and in pecuniary matters, they did all that I could desire. But no good moral results attended my ministry. Though I expected, and fondly hoped, to see in the state of Connecticut another class of men espouse my cause, and different fruits spring from my labors, than those I saw in Vermont, I was disappointed. The leading men in the Universalist society were avowed infidels. And of such the society had ever been composed. Its founders, those who built the meeting-house, and who, from the beginning of the society's existence, had sustained it, were open infidels. The first minister who preached in the Universalist meeting-house, found great trouble from this source; and finally was dismissed because

he preached against infidelity, and would not desist when told that he must. A very large number of the active men in the society under my charge, avowed to me their disbelief in the inspiration of the Bible. A majority of my committee, the clerk of the society, with seven eighths of the pew-holders, were possessed of the same opinions. My warmest personal friends, those the most regular in their attendance on preaching, the most liberal in their support of Universalism, women as well as men, were frank enough to tell me, in my parochial visits, that they had no more faith in the Bible than they had in the Koran. Some few, perhaps, read the Bible to find proof texts of Universalism; but, for the most part, few opened it at all; and in no case that I ever knew, was it read in the family as an act of religious duty.

If you ask, why such persons attended meeting at all, if they were unbelievers in the Bible, I will give you the reason they assigned to me when I proposed the same question. They thought that superstition, as they used to call religion, should be checked;—that something must be done to keep their wives and children from being Orthodox;—the world, they thought, was not yet quite prepared for a full advocacy of truth, and Universalism came so near their idea of truth, that it was the best thing the world at present would bear. Hence they supported its ministry.

But the absence of good moral results was not the only evil with which I was called to contend. I not only turned no sinner from the error of his ways; *called back* no soul from the road of death; but I saw

positive evils attending my labors. Many who attended my ministry were grossly immoral, and more were waxing worse and worse.

One fact that transpired among others, made me very unhappy. On Sabbath evenings my church was usually crowded with young men. Many of these would leave the bar-rooms and dram-shops in the vicinity of my meeting-house, attend my lecture, and then retire again, at its close, to those places of infamy, and there pass nearly the whole night. They would drink my health, and praise me and my sermons in the awful words of profaneness and blasphemy.

Though I did not allow that my preaching encouraged licentiousness, I could not, if I would, disguise from myself the fact, that those young men thought that my doctrine strengthened their hands, and promised life to the wicked, though they turned not from their wicked ways. Else, why should they pause in their career of sin, enter my congregation, and, at the close of my service, return again to their licentious ways, and praise me according to my works, in the fearful terms to which I have already alluded?

The influence of these things upon my mind was disastrous in the extreme. I was oppressed beyond measure. I was not satisfied with the tendency of my faith; yet I thought my system was not an error. I did not wish to do my fellow-men an injury; still I knew that many could justly accuse me as being the author of their ruin.

When I removed to Hartford, I was a young man, just passed twenty-one years; zealous and full of hope. I had taken my opinions on religion, second

hand, from the oracles of Universalism, as my associates had done; and was entirely ignorant of the doctrines and character of the Orthodox community. I was soon made acquainted with the general character of those to whom I ministered. I was appalled at the sight. Surrounded by a religious population, I was mortified at the result of my labors. When I attended a meeting of other sects, and felt that among them was a good spirit, such as I found not among my associates, I was more dissatisfied with my system. Troubled with anxious doubts, pained with the moral results of my faith, worn down by anxiety and incessant labor, I was reduced by disease; the hand of sickness was laid upon me; and in a moment of delirium I revealed what was passing in my mind. My whole theme, during my alienation, was Universalism, its tendency, and the insufficiency of the proof by which it was supported. I wrote much and talked much, upon this subject. I subsequently learned that I had held conversations with Rev. Dr. Hawes and Rev. Mr. Fitch, upon the subject of Universalism. The nature of my conversation may be learned by the subjoined extract from a letter from Rev. Mr. Fitch.

When I wrote my lectures upon Universalism, I took this letter, and drew them up upon the plan suggested in it.

"HARTFORD, *June* 29, 1835.

"REV. MR. SMITH,

"Dear Sir, — I received your note this *morning,* and with pleasure I hasten to reply. Events

which have transpired since your last communication are doubtless known to you through your friends. To these I wish to refer. I trust, however, that you will do me the justice to believe that I do it with feelings of purest kindness. Doubtless you will wish to know the conversation which passed between us at the time of your alienation of mind. On the morning of the 19th of May, if I mistake not, you called at my house, and, after common remarks on common subjects, I placed in your hands Cooke's reply to Balfour's Inquiry, asking whether you had read it. You replied that you had read only extracts from it, and said, 'I am not a Universalist. I am convinced that it is not the doctrine of the Bible. I find stronger arguments against it than I have ever seen penned, and I have informed my people that I can preach for them no longer. I find a large class of passages in the Bible which I have never seen adduced to disprove the doctrine, which I think bear more strongly against it than any others; particularly that class which represents the Christian as in a race, and running to obtain the prize. A greater part of those who believe the doctrine of universal salvation know no more about the Bible than they do about the Koran. They do not open their Bibles once in six months. There are a few who study the Bible hard for proof of the doctrine, but the greater part know almost nothing of what is in the Bible. I have often noticed the character of those who came to hear me preach as I went from place to place. After preaching, I must go to a tavern, as there was nowhere else to go, and my hearers would fill up the bar-room, and

begin to talk loud, and I could not avoid overhearing them. They would say, "He is a *damned smart fellow;* he preached a *hell of a good sermon.*" I have heard precisely that language in Oxford, in this state; and I have heard similar language a hundred times, and it used to make me blush. I found that while I would preach the doctrine of universal salvation, and nothing else, my hearers were pleased; but as soon as I turned my face against any vice, they were offended. I have preached against gambling, and other sins, but I always found that my people did not like it. I have known young men in this city, who used to attend upon Orthodox preaching, and were young men of regular and correct habits; but they were drawn into my meeting, embraced my sentiments, and soon began to lead a very different life. I could name a particular individual.

"'Persons have frequently come to me with objections which they had heard used against the doctrine of universal salvation, wishing me to remove them; and I have replied to these objections, so as apparently to satisfy those who brought them, but not so as to satisfy myself. I have often been struck with the difference between the meetings of your denomination and ours. I have been in your meetings, particularly the union meetings of the different Congregational churches, the last winter. I found there something like devotion. In our meetings there was no devotion in the prayers, and no devotion in the preaching. But in your meetings I found a different air. In relation to the society, in this place, *many* of them are infidels. You may divide the

society, and out of it take every man who believes in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, and all these together would not be sufficient to pay an organist. I say this, because I know it to be a fact.'

"After you had an interview with your committee, I saw you again, when you told me that they wished to know your reasons for renouncing the doctrine of universal salvation; and that you stated to them the three following: '1. That the passages of Scripture on which you had relied for support of the doctrine did not prove it. 2. That you found a large class of passages which taught a doctrine contrary to it. 3. The fruits of the doctrine.' And, sir, if you would but just listen to the dictates of your own conscience, I believe that heaven would rejoice and earth be glad, and that souls who are now entangled in the snares of the great adversary, would be set at liberty and guided into the path of life. You remarked to me at your own house, that you had felt, that, like Paul, you would like to preach the faith which you had destroyed. I did hope that such a time would come, and most fervently do still pray God that it may. You have helped to forge and fasten the chains of Satan's bondage on many an immortal soul; and it is my prayer that God will yet make you a chosen vessel of his to fit *some* of those at least for heaven.

Your friend,

CHARLES FITCH."

When I had in some measure recovered my health, I felt that I could not remain longer in Hartford. I resigned my trust, and resolved to seek a new field

of labor. My faith in the ultimate salvation of all men was unchanged. But upon many subjects my feelings and views were essentially different. I was compelled to reject ultra Universalism, or, in other words, that form of Universalism which limits all punishment to this life. I had preached more against the faith of other sects, than against the sins of my own society. I determined to be more practical; to preach more upon the duties of life, and less upon the certainty of the salvation of all men. My removal from Hartford, and a change of scene and occupation, for a season diverted my mind, and I was comparatively at ease in my ministry.

SETTLEMENT AT SALEM, MASS.

My last settlement as a Universalist preacher was in Salem, Massachusetts. A short season of labor in that city convinced me that Universalism was the same every where. My congregation was one of the largest in Salem. The practical results of my ministry were the same as they had been in all other places.

I have already said, that, before I left Hartford, I had adopted the doctrine of limited future punishment. It seemed to me that the Bible did reveal future retribution, and that no good could attend the preaching that assured men that, if they could but reach the grave, reach it how they might, they would be saved; and that though they should die in their sins, they would not be excluded from heaven. In a practical point of view, the effect was the same as the *preaching* of ultra Universalism. As punishment was

to end in eternal bliss, those who adopted these views had little care, whether it was limited to this life or ran over into the next.

By adopting the doctrine of future punishment, I found myself involved in difficulties that endangered my faith in the salvation of all men. If the reasoning were sound by which I proved limited future punishment, then endless punishment was true; for the same reasons which demand *future* punishment would demand its *perpetuity*.

I could find no evidence that the future was to be a life of probation; or that men, in the next state of existence, would have an opportunity to do what they had failed or refused to accomplish in this. The truth was clearly revealed that the "wicked would be turned into hell," "and go away into everlasting punishment;" but it was not as clearly revealed that the wicked would be delivered from the one, or that the other would cease. The earnest appeals of "To-day"—"Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation"—"To-day if ye will hear his voice"—"The night cometh, in which no man can work"—"If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins"—"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest"—these, and kindred passages, seemed very clearly to teach that *this* is the world in which to prepare for that life which is to come; and that all who waste or misimprove it, will find eternity too short to repair the injury done to the soul.

But not only did the Bible seem to teach, that this

life is the place in which to secure salvation, but as clearly it seemed to say, that the destiny of man is fixed at death, and remains unchanged forever. The gulf that separates the righteous from the wicked, which *cannot* be passed, proves it. In the resurrection, there is to be no change of character. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." The words of Jesus Christ to the impenitent Jews, "If thou hadst known, even thou at least, in *this thy day*, the things which belong unto thy peace! *but now they are hid from thine eyes;*" and the instruction of Paul, that to those who wilfully resist the truth, God will "send strong delusions," and leave them to "believe a lie;" all teach that probation may close before this life ends. The zeal of the rich man in hell for the salvation of his impenitent brethren, and the exclusion of the foolish virgins, who came too late to be admitted, admonish us, that, though remorse and repentance could be found in the world of woe, no remission is there, and from hell there is no redemption. Nor could I see why Christ came into this world at all to save any soul. If one man can be saved in the next life, all can be; and the sufferings of Christ were in vain. Also, the simple fact, that, in the next state of existence, there will be no Mediator; that as soon as Christ puts his enemies under his feet, he gives up the mediatorial kingdom,—afforded evidence to my mind, that the impenitent can enjoy no restoration from punishment in the eternal world.

In any case, future punishment involved endless misery. Universalists affirm that, in all cases, the good of the punished alone is sought by the penalty of the divine law; that, if punishment extends to the future world, it will continue till men repent, cease sinning, and turn to God; and when this end is answered, misery will end. Those who allow future punishment, have never been able to determine how long it will continue. A thousand years, ten thousand, and a million, have been mentioned as the probable duration of future punishment. Mr. Winchester, one of the founders of the sect of Universalists, thought the ungodly would be punished an inconceivable number of years; ages and ages would roll away before their sufferings should end.

For the argument's sake, suppose we limit the period of punishment to one thousand years. During this period of time, the ungodly will sin, or they will not. If they commit no sin, then why punish them at all? The end is attained at the outset. Before one pang is inflicted, the victims are all that they will be at the expiration of the thousand years. They have ceased to sin; and this is all that the punishment was to accomplish. But if they sin, and if it requires a thousand years to punish the sins of this brief state of existence, how long will it take to punish the sins committed in the next? Let the punishment of the impenitent continue as long as it may, there will be always more sins unpunished than have received a just recompense of reward. And the same reasons which demand future punishment will demand its perpetuity.

Considerations such as these made me indescribably wretched. I could not give up my faith in the salvation of all men: I could not deny the doctrine of future retribution; nor could I separate future punishment from endless death. Neither was it from this source alone that trouble arose. The more I reflected upon the system of Universalism, the more perplexed I became. I knew that my influence was not exerted for the good of my race. I labored hard, preached often, but felt I was not advancing the good of man. Of the evil practical tendency of my faith I had no doubt; I could have none. I was not as confident as I had been of its truth, nor as much so as I wished to be. Many arguments, and those the most popular among Universalists, I knew to be sophistical. Many texts of Scripture urged in defence of Universalism, I was convinced, had no reference to the salvation of all men; and many parts of the Bible so plainly taught a different doctrine, that I was distressed beyond measure. I could find no peace except when I banished the whole subject from my mind, and by a great effort turned my attention to something else. I wrote and preached often under the influence of doubts, that, at times, almost overwhelmed me. I once resolved to settle the case with my own mind, and put it at rest. I wrote a sermon in which I arrayed all that I could think of in defence of Universalism. The arguments from reason, nature, and the Bible, in favor of the salvation of all men, I presented in their strongest form. I wrote it under the influence of the most tormenting doubts, to remove those doubts if possible. But the effort was not successful. I preached the sermon but

once. My people requested it for the press. *I gave it to the flames.*

My situation was a most trying and painful one. I was determined to cling to Universalism. Yet I could not with all my heart defend it, nor remove the objections that rose against it. When I sought relief by conversing with my ministerial associates, I found them often deeper in difficulty than I was myself. As they would relate their experience, and unfold what they had seen of the moral results of Universalism, the effect was most startling upon my own mind. As I heard men, who had been years in the ministry, express their difficulty in defending Universalism, call up objections to it more appalling than any I had ever heard from the lips of an opposer, and expose the sophistry of many popular arguments used in its defence, I was convinced, if the world knew the objections with which the defenders of Universalism had to contend, no stronger proof of its falsehood would be needed.

CHANGE IN MY STYLE OF PREACHING.

To succeed at all, I was compelled to dismiss the subject of man's destiny altogether from my sermons, and say nothing in respect to the final salvation of all men. I could neither deny nor defend the doctrine. And I thought, if I should dwell upon the practical duties of life, and preach upon moral subjects, I might relieve myself from trouble upon this point. I wholly changed my style of preaching, and attempted to instruct men in relation to the duties which belong to

this life. This change in the subjects of my sermons was soon noticed, and complained of. Some desired a little more doctrine. Others thought the youth ought to be indoctrinated, and that the minister ought to do it. From various sources, I would hear that strangers who entered my church could not tell what my views were; and my society considered it a reproach, that men could hear a Universalist preach, and not know whether or not he believed that all men would be saved. While others, out of regard to my health and ease, desired me to preach some of my old sermons, — the design being to obtain the doctrine which those sermons were known to contain.

My mind was far from being at rest. My difficulties increased, and the evidence of my faith seemed to grow more and more faint. Most gladly would I have dismissed this whole matter from my mind, but I could not. Though I was not now an advocate of Universalism, — though for some months I had ceased to teach that all would be saved, — still I was known as a Universalist preacher. I was settled over a Universalist congregation, and my influence was exerted in favor of their known sentiments. I had ceased to respect the system, or to feel much attachment to its advocates. I now felt that, as an honest man, I could not represent a system which was at war with the best interests of my race; though I had not given up my faith in the final salvation of all men. After much anxiety and deliberation, I sent to the committee of the Universalist society in Salem the following letter: —

"SALEM, *March* 17, 1840.

"*To the Committee of the Universalist Society.*

"Brethren,—No man can feel more than myself the sacred nature of that tie which unites pastor and people, nor be more sensible that it should not be severed for a slight or trivial cause. My connection with the society whom you represent, has been of the most pleasant character. For it I have a high esteem, and the attentions which I have received at the hands of its members have endeared them to my heart. From repeated and friendly conversation with prominent members of the society, I have reason to believe that they desire and expect their minister to subserve an interest which in conscience I cannot. They expect him to feel a sympathy with the denomination of Universalists, to act in concert with it, to be called by its name, and be in reality, if not in form, identified with it. As I cannot answer this expectation in any of the above-named particulars, justice to myself and to you seems to require that we have a clear understanding of this matter.

"Of the fact that I have received no new revelation of theological faith, you are advised by the repeated conversations I have held with you. And with the motives that have led me to separate myself from the denomination of Universalists, you are acquainted, at least with most of them. And as you can inform the society, who may wish to be informed, I need not repeat them here. To the society of which I am pastor, I have devoted a portion of the best part of my life. I am firm in the consciousness of having served it to the best of *my ability*, and of having spared no

labor that I thought would add to its profit. I desire no better friends, and I seek no better society. If I could serve the society without acting in concert or being identified with the denomination of Universalists, I should be ready and happy so to do.

"If, however, the society should insist upon such a concert of action, I shall hold myself ready, cheerfully, and with the kindest feelings, forthwith to tender my resignation of the office of pastor, and with it all the duties, trials, and responsibilities of that trust. We have lived together affectionately, — let us part in peace and kindness.

"I will call your early attention to the subject of this epistle; and, offering you, individually and collectively, the assurance of my esteem, I subscribe myself,

Affectionately yours,

M. HALE SMITH."

Upon the receipt of this letter, the committee to whom it was sent, called upon me, to induce me to take it back. They were surprised at the letter; the step they thought was a hasty one, — one that I should always regret. They were certain that to remove from the society of which I was pastor, and throw myself and family upon the world, was committing a suicidal act. They assured me that, if I would take back the letter, and continue my labors, they would pledge me their honors that no mortal should ever know it had been written. I told them that I was prepared for almost any thing; but I could *not eat the bread* of dishonesty. The sentiments ex-

pressed in my letter, I could not change. By them I must abide. My resignation followed the reception of that letter, and my connection with Universalism ceased from that hour.

Many of my friends urged me to preach to them for a few weeks. As I was not decided what to do, nor where to locate myself, I yielded to their request. This taking myself away from the denomination of Universalists, and renouncing the name, was simply to obey "the voice of duty." It was a great step to take, but I was not at rest. The same voice commanded me again, and I could not refuse to obey. I was assailed with doubts in respect to the *truth* of the idea that all men would be saved. The threatenings of the Bible were many, and they were awful. Much of the reasoning employed to prove that all men would be saved, I was certain was unsound.

REVIEW OF UNIVERSALISM.

To satisfy myself, I resolved to review the whole matter. I collected the threatenings of the Bible, with all the objections that I knew to exist against Universalism, and placed them together. I then selected all the texts of Scripture, and the arguments used in defence of Universalism; and determined to examine them, to be faithful to myself, and abide by the result. I felt in some measure the responsibility that rested upon me, and the awful hazard I was running in encouraging the wicked to hope for life, though they turn not from their wicked way. I went to this work with a trembling, and, I trust,

a prayerful spirit. As I shall bring out this investigation in another place, I shall omit it in this lecture.

RESULT OF REVIEW.

I arose from this investigation firmly persuaded that Universalism was supported neither by reason nor revelation; that it was as false in theory as it was destructive in practice. But, "What is truth?" "What shall I preach?" were questions more easily put than solved. For the system of doctrine usually denominated Orthodox, I had the most perfect contempt. Language does not enable me to express the abhorrence in which I held it. If I ever detested any thing, it was the doctrines of the cross. The clergy who defended them, I thought to be narrow-minded, bigoted, and, on many very important subjects, very ignorant. The people who professed those doctrines, I regarded as a poor, infatuated class of men, duped and blinded by their leaders, and as having little comfort in this world, and little hope of any in the world to come. My prejudice against the Orthodox religion, and those identified with it, was very strong. I had no inclination to search for truth among them, and no desire to embrace it, if convinced that they held it.

CONVICTION OF SIN.

Up to this time, the investigation had been purely an intellectual one. It had been an examination of *the question,* whether Universalism were true or not.

With me, religion had been a mere theory. I had a system to defend, and must defend it. But now, my attention was turned to the subject of personal piety, —to the question whether I had met with that change, and formed that character, which the Bible declared to be essential to salvation. I felt that there was a reality in religion, which I had never known, a power that I had never enjoyed. I longed for something that would take hold of my own heart, and allow me to speak to the hearts of my fellow-men. I was now, in a measure, afloat. I had no settled opinions upon religion. On what side soever I turned, I found difficulties; and on all sides, the horizon was black indeed. The system I had long cherished, and which was bound to my heart by the ties of early instruction and constant association, had passed from my confidence. My warmest friends had, in many cases, become my bitterest foes; though they had not yet learned to what extent I had given up my faith in Universalism. I had no religious acquaintance, to whom I could unburden my mind. My sufferings were great; my anguish more exquisite than language can paint. I did not know where to go, or to whom I could speak; and it seemed to me literally, that "no man cared for my soul." I would have given all I possessed, to have found some friend to whom I could have unbosomed myself; who would have said some kind thing, or bid me hope in God. But I did not dare trust even my own family. Though it seemed to me that every man I met read my feelings in my countenance, I *kept them* to myself till I was carried

almost into my grave. I was in very feeble health; my associations all were changed; I was unsettled in faith, and felt like a stranger in a strange iand.

MEDICAL ADVICE.

My frame, never vigorous, could not sustain the load placed upon it. My long anxiety in respect to the moral results of my faith, my painful investigation, the separation from my society, the scandal, hatred, and ill-will I was called to meet from those whom I had long served according to my ability, my anxious cares, my mental trouble, the fear that I was not a Christian,—all impaired my health to a startling degree. A complaint, which, from my childhood, has been the bane of my existence, and which in Hartford had led to temporary derangement, threatened to return. I was admonished that it was time to seek medical advice.

I could not answer the questions of my physician without a full disclosure of my feelings. I had borne my anguish alone, with none to help me. For some time, I debated in my own mind the question, whether I ought to confide in my physician or not. I decided that it was my duty so to do. I told him all my feelings; how wretched I had been, and how afflicted I then was; how much the results of my public labors distressed me; how dark the future seemed to be; and how unsettled, how unspeakably wretched I was. I knew not what to do, nor where to look for relief. Life seemed to me a burden, and I would *gladly welcome* the grave. My physician was touched

with my distress, and pitied my case. Though not a professor of religion, he respected it, and wept with me. It was the first sympathy I had received; and cold water to a thirsty soul was never more grateful, than was the knowledge of the fact, that some one could feel an interest in my welfare, and wish me a happy deliverance from all my woes. He urged me to seek assistance from some religious person; and not to bear my state of mind alone, as I was incurring a great risk in so doing.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH REV. DR. HAWES.

I felt that it was my duty to comply with the advice given. But I was not willing to commit myself by seeking sympathy or instruction from those near me, who were competent to the task. With Rev. Dr. Hawes, of Hartford, Connecticut, I had some acquaintance, growing out of my residence in that city. I had confidence in him as a man and a Christian; and I resolved to write to him. I did it with a trembling spirit, and with great misgiving as to the probable reception my letter would meet. With much prayer and many tears, I wrote and mailed the following letter: —

"SALEM, *April* 21, 1840.

"REV. DR. HAWES,

"Dear Sir, — I have, after serious and prayerful deliberation, resolved to address to you this epistle. As its contents are known to none but my Maker and yourself, I will ask you to hold in confidence its sentiments. My personal respect for you,

and the circumstances that transpired when I was in Connecticut, are the only apology I offer to you for my present freedom. The period of my residence in Hartford was to me a very gloomy one. My labors were not attended with such results as I expected or desired. Surrounded by a religious population, I was mortified and grieved at the contrast. In the silence of my study, and in the hushed watches of the night, questions would arise that I could not answer. Worn down by anxiety and incessant toil, my health failed me, and a complaint which long has been, and is even now, the bane of my existence, obtained the mastery; and, in a moment of delirium, I revealed what was passing in my mind. Rev. Mr. Fitch informed me of my interview both with yourself and him. And the revelations of that solemn moment were true. From that time to the present, I have been unhappy. Though my faith in the final restitution of all things was not shaken, I was confident that *ultra* Universalism was not from God, and that its preaching tended to injury. I changed my style of preaching, and became more practical, not always to the satisfaction of my people. Since my residence in Salem, my labors have been all that I could desire, save in this,—that men have not been turned to the service of God, from Satan. But I have never been satisfied. Agitated, anxious, doubting, miserable; preaching in the face of evidence I could neither gainsay nor withstand; not daring to express a doubt, nor to seek counsel; and feeling that the insane retreat, or the grave, would soon receive me, if my mental conflict continued,—I signified to my

society that, as I had no sympathy with the Universalists, I could not serve them, unless they wished my services with that understanding. My committee labored with me long and ardently, to have me recall the letter, saying, they would consider it as not written; but if the matter came before the society, it would not retain me an hour. The result has been a separation from my society; and many, who, a week or two ago, would have plucked out their eyes, almost, and given them to me, are now my determined foes. About fifty families desire me to preach to them. But, if I bear not the name of Universalist, they will expect me to preach that all will be saved. My physician, a member of the 'Tabernacle Society,' the only man to whom I have breathed a word on this subject, having advised me to take counsel from some one in whom I could confide, I have thus spoken freely to you. Now, my dear sir, what is duty? I know the wrong. But how can I know the right, unless some man guide me? O that I could know the way! Most cheerfully would I walk in the path of duty. But these doubts, this rending anxiety, of years' continuance, have driven me well nigh to despair.

"For the stand I have thus taken I have made great sacrifices; and I am ready to make more, if needful.

"If you think it worthy of your time and attention, please write me soon. I shall wait your answer with deep solicitude. May it be a word in due season!

"I am, reverend sir, with sentiments of great respect,

"Your obedient servant,

"M. Hale Smith."

I had scarcely mailed this letter, and returned to my residence, before I regretted having sent it. A thousand suggestions, temptations, fears, and resolutions, occupied my mind. They ended in a determination to take the letter from the post-office. I visited the office, and requested the privilege of withdrawing the letter. I was told that it was too late. It was on its way to Hartford. With the deepest anxiety, I awaited the reply; and my agitation and trembling I cannot describe when I took from the office the following response:—

"HARTFORD, *April* 24, 1840.

"My dear Sir,—Your letter, received this morning, has been read with deep emotion. I thank you for the confidence you repose in me; and the prayer has already been more than once breathed to Heaven that the good Spirit of the Lord, who, I doubt not, is dealing with you in mercy, may guide you into the right way, and give you peace in believing. There is, my friend, a way of *peace:* it is the way of cordial reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ; of love to his character and service, produced within us by the Holy Spirit, renewing the heart and sealing us heirs of Heaven. You appear to me to be sincerely '*feeling*' after this way, and if you truly seek direction from above, you will, I trust, ere long find it, and walk in it with firm step and bright hope. May God grant you this mercy! I scarcely know to what point to direct my remarks. You surely do not expect me to enter into any discussion of the subject respecting *which we have* held opposite sentiments. *Your* views

on that subject are not settled; *mine* are; and should you finally come to where I trust the Lord is leading you, present difficulties respecting future retribution, would, I have no doubt, pass away, and your mind would be at rest on that subject of deep and awful interest. At least, you would be able to say, 'Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight.' Your readiness to endure trials for what you deem the truth, gives me pleasing evidence that your faith, if not now, will ere long be right on all essential points. What I feel the most solicitous about, is, that you keep your conscience void of offence. On this point, you have been, and will be, severely tried. The Lord enable you to stand firm! If former friends desert you, or 'become foes,' other friends will rise up in their place; and, what is more, you will have a friend in God, who will never forsake you.

"If you cannot preach Universalism *through* and *through* with *perfect confidence* of its *truth* and *fitness to turn men* from *Satan* unto *God*, then have no connection with it. If it is an error, — as I of course believe it to be, — it is certainly a great and dangerous one; and in your present state of mind, you cannot say or do any thing which shall seem to uphold it, without doing violence to conscience, and exposing yourself to be left of the Holy Spirit, who, I doubt not, is waking up your mind to inquiry respecting the true way of salvation. I say this in reference to the 'families who (you say) desire you to preach to them, though not under the name of Universalist, yet as an advocate of the doctrine that all will be saved.' I should fear the result *of such an* experiment. Better be silent,

than preach a gospel which in your *heart* you do not know to be true. Is there not a deeper question than whether all will be saved, which is now pressing on your mind for decision, viz.: Have you been born again, born of the Spirit? In other words, are you a Christian in such a sense as the Bible declares essential to our entering into life? The agitation, anxiety, and doubts, which so harass your mind, will never pass away till this great point is settled. My pen so poorly expresses what I want to say, that I have hardly any patience in using it. I wish I could see you, and talk over all this great subject. But as I am denied the pleasure, may I recommend you to visit Professor Stuart of Andover? He will enter into your feelings at once, and I know of no Christian friend to whom I could so readily direct you for counsel. You must not brood over your present state of mind *alone*. You need Christian sympathy, and must have it. In the mean time, rest assured that you have a friend in me who will be happy to afford you any aid in my power.

"Most truly yours,

"J. HAWES."

A letter so full of Christian sympathy I did not expect, and, I know not why, I was unmanned for a season, and unfitted for any duty. As soon as my feelings subsided, I resolved to be a Christian, if God would give me grace, to live in his service, and die in his cause.

But peace came not in an hour. A deep probing *of my own* soul took place. My sins were set in

order before me, and unless help came from the cross, I felt that I must perish, and perish most justly. Against great light I had sinned, and long and wilfully resisted the truth. I had employed my strength in strengthening the hands of the wicked, and peopling the world of despair with immortal souls. What right had I to expect mercy? what claim upon the grace of God? I was encompassed with awful fears. My days were wretched,—my nights were passed in anguish that drove sleep from my pillow. I was awfully tempted to leave this world unbidden, but I dared not do it. I was certain, if I did, I should go to hell. My appetite was gone, my health declining, my strength almost exhausted. O, the wormwood and the gall of those dark and trying moments! How vivid they stand out upon my memory! How harrowing the recital! I have barely firmness sufficient to pen these events.

But God at last heard my prayer, and gave me peace—peace more welcome to my lacerated heart, than was the sunlight to the inmates of the tempest-tossed ark, after their long sojourn upon the waste of waters. Gladness was in my soul, and praise upon my lip.

MY WIFE INFORMED OF MY CHANGE.

I have already said, that, in the time of my trial, I had not confided my feelings to any one. My family knew I was sick; but they were strangers to my mental sufferings; I did not dare trust any one. My wife from her youth up had been a Universalist. I knew she would pity, but could not relieve me; and

that a knowledge of my situation would make her unhappy, while it could be of no advantage to myself. But having made up my mind, and committed myself to my Savior, I felt it my duty to give her that information myself, which she would soon learn from others. But another motive influenced me. I knew that my former friends would never forgive me for leaving Universalism. I expected bitter persecution and most intense hatred from those who professed to have the strongest regard for me before my change. It became a question full of painful interest, whether I should turn from all this scandal and reproach, and find sympathy at my own hearthstone; or whether I should find a divided home. For aught that I knew to the contrary, my companion was still fondly attached to Universalism. I expected she would be disappointed, grieved, and I knew not what else, when she learned that I was not only no Universalist, but had embraced the despised doctrines of the Orthodox faith. I prepared myself for whatever might occur, prayed for wisdom and grace rightly to perform my duty, and related to my wife what God had done for my soul. I could gather nothing during the narration to inform me as to the effect. My companion was deeply affected; but whether from disappointment, or from sympathy with my sufferings, I could not tell. I closed my recital, and paused for a reply. Judge my astonishment, when she said, "O, I am so thankful that you have been thus guided!" I could not trust my senses. I asked to hear the remark again; the same sentence was repeated, and by it I was completely over-

whelmed. I learned, to my utter astonishment, that, for more than one year, Mrs. S. had been convinced that Universalism was an error, and had renounced it. Her faith in Universalism was first shaken by the conduct and conversation of Universalist ministers, who visited at my house. She felt that a system could be neither true nor profitable, which had such advocates. She had long held communion with her Savior; and, in her own closet, unaided by religious instruction, and uncounseled by religious friends, sitting under a ministry of error, and with no guide but her Bible, she had been turned from the way of death, and, some months before my change, had found the Savior to be precious to her soul. Her fears that a knowledge of her change would make me unhappy, and that I could not sympathize with her, induced her to withhold from me the fact, that her faith had been changed, and her heart been renewed. Could I do less than adore the grace and goodness of God? Could any one marvel that our first family altar should be one of thanksgiving to that God who had opened our eyes, touched our hearts, and enabled us to begin together a new life in Christ?

DREADFUL CONDITION.

My condition may be imagined, but it cannot be described. For a long time, I had been distressed with the evil moral tendency of the system of which I was the minister. For a long time, I was troubled with heart-rending doubts, that almost overwhelmed

me. Often was I called to preach in the face of evidence which I could not gainsay. Then I became anxious about my own soul, and was fearful that the blood of souls would be required at my hands. My former friends had nearly all forsaken me, and become my bitter foes. They left no means untried to ruin me, and render me an outcast among men, by taking away my reputation, which was all that myself and family had to depend upon for bread. To the religious community I was comparatively a stranger; and it was supposed, that, if I were represented as unworthy of their confidence, I should be in a situation to do the cause of Universalism no harm. Not only was all manner of evil said of me, but my wife was more than once insulted in the streets, because I had changed my faith.

This state of things imposed upon me a weight more than my frame could bear. My enemies had greatly affected the public mind; and on every side I found distrust and suspicion. I was poor in this world's goods. I had given up a salary sufficient for my wants, and was now penniless, and had no means of support. My health was constantly declining. The future looked very dark. I was fearful that my mind would be overturned, and my reason lost, if relief came not to me soon.

For many weeks I was unfit for ordinary duties, much less for such exciting scenes as those through which I was called to pass. My head was the seat of dreadful distress and anguish, that seemed almost sufficient to drive me mad. I was for weeks in a state

of high mental excitement. At times, I was unable to keep the connection in the column of a newspaper. I was under the hands of my physician; and from a sick bed, on which I had been thrown by my pains, with my head covered with leeches to relieve my anguish, I was called up to address an immense congregation, under the most exciting circumstances. With great difficulty I discharged that duty. My system was prostrated, my head almost bursting with pain, and my agitation great.

I laid my head upon my pillow, but not to sleep. The next day I was to meet the Association of Salem, pass an examination, be received as a Christian minister, or be declared unworthy of confidence. I felt that, in a great measure, my future usefulness and happiness depended upon the action of the Association before which I was to appear the next day. To most of the members I was an entire stranger. Reports exhibiting me as any thing but an honest man were in circulation; and with what effect upon their minds, I could not tell. I arose from a bed of pain, to pass an examination. The circumstances, as well as my own feelings, demanded a thorough and faithful examination. I was occupied all day in scenes that almost overcame me; which, joined with my feeble health, and the almost entire prostration of my strength, made my case critical and dangerous. On the next night, I was examined for admission to the Tabernacle Church in Salem, and I closed the week with repeated, but exciting, conversations upon religion, with my former friends.

CRISIS REACHED.

But the most anxious hour was to come. On the approaching Sabbath, the first Sabbath in June, 1840, I was to take upon myself a profession of religion. This step seemed to me to be the most solemn and momentous that any man could take. It was a covenant with God, and not with men. My mind was greatly exercised in respect to this solemn transaction. I looked forward to the coming Sabbath, with fear, with trembling, with anxiety. With such feelings I sought my pillow on Saturday night. I had passed the week amid incidents of a peculiarly trying character. I had arisen from a couch of sickness on Wednesday, to give my reasons to thousands of my fellow-men for leaving Universalism. On Thursday I met the Association, passed an examination, and was approved. On Friday, I stood before the church, related my experience, and was accepted as a member. One step alone remained to be taken, and that step I was not permitted to take. Disease triumphed; my mind was impaired, and in an hour of derangement, I had wandered from my home, — wandered I knew not whither. Then followed weeks of suffering, bodily and mental, which it makes me sick at heart to recall to mind. My physical strength was gone; my mind was weak, vacillating, and easily moved; my appetite was lost, and sleep fled from my pillow. My days were a burden; my nights were seasons of anguish. Almost every thing moved me,— every thing excited me. Some of my former friends

still professed a regard for me. As oft as they saw me, they were conversing upon Universalism; urging me to review my ground, suggesting difficulties, and making objections to my new faith. I could not remove myself from them, nor avoid being at times perplexed at what was said. My mind was weak, and impressions were easily made upon it. On the other hand, a portion of my former friends followed me with unrelenting hate. All manner of evil things were said, published, and circulated. My weak and feeble state, the awful conviction that my mind was impaired beyond the hope of recovery, and that, if my health were ever restored, it would leave me only a wreck of my former self,—all this was no protection against the calumnies of my accusers. It excited no pity in their minds. Week after week, their papers, containing all the malice and falsehood that my enemies could invent, were thrown into my family, that its peace might be ruined and its comfort destroyed; and this, too, while my family were watching my sick couch, from which it was doubtful whether I should ever again arise.

VACILLATION AND DOUBTS.

But my disease did more than lay me low. It gave an instability to my views and feelings that I could not control. My mind was gloomy. Upon the strict eternity of punishment I had some doubt. Go backward I could not; advance I could not, until with my whole soul I could subscribe to all the doctrines of the gospel. It was during this season of mental

gloom and vacillation upon the *eternity* of future punishment, that the shout went up that I had returned to Universalism.

VISIT TO REV. DR. HAWES

I formed the resolution that I would for a season leave Salem, and in other scenes seek a restoration to health; and if I was to be the victim of vacillation and indecision all my days, I would seek some secular employment. I visited Hartford, Connecticut, and took up my residence in the family of Rev. Dr. Hawes. He received me as a son, and bade me welcome to his residence, and to all the instruction which I needed. I remained four weeks in his family; and pleasant hours those were that I passed in the house of that great and good man. My strength returned; my health improved to a very great degree; my mind became decided, and my heart fixed. It is but just to say, that, if I shall ever be of any service in the ministry of Jesus Christ, it will be very much owing to the friendly attentions, the judicious instructions, and the Christian sympathy, which I received from Dr. Hawes, his kind family, and his affectionate church.

PROFESSION OF RELIGION.

After this, I passed a few months at New Haven, Connecticut. On the last Sabbath in the year 1840, both Mrs. Smith and myself united with the First Church in New Haven, Connecticut, of which Rev.

Leonard Bacon is pastor. To me it was a solemn day. And may it not be regarded as a peculiar providence, that the year above-mentioned, so full of change, suffering, and anxiety, should be closed as it was? At its close I could say, —

"Now rest, my long-divided heart;
Fixed on this blissful centre, rest:
With ashes who would grudge to part,
When called on angels' food to taste?

"High Heaven, that heard the solemn vow,
That vow renewed shall daily hear,
Till in life's latest hour I bow,
And bless, in death, the bond so dear."

On the 5th day of January, 1841, I took license from the New Haven West Association, of which Rev. Dr. Day, president of Yale College, was moderator. Since my license, I have been constantly employed in attempting to build up the faith which once I destroyed. And not for one moment have I had any difficulty in relation to the great doctrines of the gospel; nor has a shadow of doubt passed over my mind in respect to any truth embraced in the confession of faith of the church to which I belong. With my whole heart I embraced it; with my whole heart I defend it.

CONCLUSION.

If any one has ever had reason to bless God for his mercy, it is myself. In my most trying moments, I ever trusted that he who bruised the reed would not break it. Long ago I had perished but for the good-

ness of God. But for this I had fainted. Against very great light I have sinned, and most richly deserved to perish. For a long time, I have been visited with serious impressions. God's Spirit has often reproved me, and bid me turn. But long and wilfully I rebelled. I trifled with my doubts, resisted light, and hated instruction, till I merited the sentence, "Let him alone; he is a blind leader of the blind." But God in mercy followed me by his Spirit, and would not let me go. Against my firm resolves, he stripped my system from me; against my wish, he made me see its deformity, and abhor myself because of my connection with it. When I hated the truth, and reviled the employments of those who fear God, he touched my heart, subdued my hatred, and caused me to love the truth, and all who love my Savior's praise. He has also nerved my frame, strengthened my feeble system, and enabled me to stand in the place he has allotted to me.

And now, as I enter the house of God with new feelings; when I find a new delight in the service of God, and in the place of prayer and praise; when I remember that I sought no light, desired no change of heart or opinion, and that I now love God, and his people, and the doctrines I once despised, and the duties I once detested; and when even creation wears a lovelier garb, and Providence, no longer dark and frowning, sets forth the hand of my Father; — can I too much adore the grace that snatched me as a brand from the burning? can I too much magnify the divine mercy? or speak too often of his long-suffering? O, can any employment so become my tongue

as that which calls me forth to tell what God has done for my soul? It is the Lord's doing, — the work is his. To his service be my days henceforth devoted! To his name be all the glory!

I have said that nearly all my near relatives were Universalists. There is an exception to this remark; and did I not name it, I should do injustice to the best friend I ever had. My own mother was not a Universalist. She was a religious woman. I have no remembrance of her; for she died before my memory received any impressions of her words or looks. I cannot recall any thing in relation to her. But those who knew her well, speak of her piety and love for the things of God. I was her youngest child; and she wished to live to train me up for God, and to guide me in the way of life. Very early in my life, I was made acquainted with her dying employment. As death approached, she called for me, and took me in her arms, and pressed me to her bosom with her dying embrace. Her last tears were shed for me; her last breath was spent in prayer to God for my welfare and my salvation. It was her dying petition that I might be saved from impiety and sin, and become a useful Christian. That death-bed, and the last moments of my mother, have never left my mind, since first I was told of her dying hours. When far gone in error, this scene has spoken to me. When many have thought me hardened, past feeling and past redemption, this has made my mind tender, and sometimes almost overwhelmed me. It has spoken to me, when mothers have come to me in relation to their sons, — as mothers *often* have done, — and have said,

with streaming eyes, "My son has become vicious and intemperate; he is the companion of the dissolute and the abandoned; he breaks the Sabbath, and scoffs at the name of God. And when I warn him, — when I tell him of the judgment, and the retributions of eternity, — he laughs my fears to scorn. He tells me that there is no judgment, that the Bible reveals no punishment for the future state, and he appeals to you and to your preaching to sustain him." And when such persons have urged me to use my influence to save their sons from ruin, and turn them from the way of death, I have felt the force of such appeals. The voice of my mother seemed to blend with the touching eloquence of those who pleaded for their sons. Then have I regretted my employment; and, half convinced, been almost tempted to throw up a calling that most manifestly strengthened the hands of the wicked.

Next to my existence, and the conversion of my soul, I would bless God for a praying mother. I could do no less than record this tribute to her memory, and leave on record the part she bore in my rescue from death. Let all take courage, who have the moulding of young minds, who make the first impressions upon an immortal soul. No matter how hard the soil, — how long the seed lies in the ground. If it be good seed, sown in faith and prayer, it will not fail. The hand that sowed may be palsied by death; the eye that wept may be closed in its long sleep; the voice that counselled may be hushed; and the heart that prayed may cease to beat. Still *the blessing* will come. Your son, or brother, or

friend, may be upon the ocean; he may fall into temptation and crime, or sit in the seat of the scorner. But upon the mast-head at midnight, in the haunt of sin, in the congregation of the impious, you will be remembered. If faithful to their souls, your sons and daughters will gather around your tomb, to bless you for what you have done for them.

How can I review my past life? The retrospect is terrible beyond description. Twelve years of this short life wasted, and worse than wasted! Employed in strengthening the hands of the wicked; in removing the restraints of the Bible; in preaching peace to the ungodly; in assuring them that they would not die, though they disobeyed God; in alluring men to destruction; in turning men from life to death; and in speaking encouragement to those already in the road to destruction, and urging them on their perilous way! O, what a retrospect! My pathway seems strewed with the wrecks and ruins of souls! My hands and my garments seem stained with the blood of my fellow-men. On every side, lost souls cry out, "But for you, we might have been saved!" O that I could recall the past! O that I could wipe out the influence I have exerted, and make those twelve years a blank! Could I do this, I would make any sacrifice. I would weep tears of blood, if I had them, to remove the impressions I have made upon the souls of men, while I was in the ministry of error. But this I cannot do. All that remains for me is, to lift my voice in defence of truth, and tell men what great things God has done for my soul.

"The world will wonder, when they see
A wretch like me restored;
And cry, Behold, how changed is he
Who once despised the Lord!"

Such are my reasons for renouncing Universalism, so far as connected with my religious experience. These alone would be sufficient. I could not resist such light. I could not trifle with such convictions. God has been very gracious to me. To his name be the glory, — to his service be my remaining days devoted!

"People of the living God,
I have sought the world around;
Paths of sin and folly trod,
Peace and comfort nowhere found.
Now to you my spirit turns, —
Turns a fugitive unblest;
Brethren, where your altar burns,
O, receive me into rest.

"Lonely I no longer roam,
Like the cloud, the wind, the wave,
Where you dwell shall be my home,
Where you die shall be my grave:
Mine the God whom you adore,
Your Redeemer shall be mine;
Earth can fill this heart no more;
Every idol I resign!"

LECTURE II.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, ARISING FROM THE DIFFICULTIES THAT ATTEND ITS DEFENCE.

2 TIM. ii. 25.

IN MEEKNESS INSTRUCTING THOSE THAT OPPOSE THEMSELVES; IF GOD PERADVENTURE WILL GIVE THEM REPENTANCE TO THE ACKNOWLEDGING OF THE TRUTH.

THE preaching of Universalism is attended with great trial. Many are the objections to it, arising from the contradictions in the system, its bad practical tendency, the irrelevancy of testimony offered from Scripture in proof of it, the sophistical nature of a large part of the arguments urged in vindication of its claims, and the passages of the Bible which obviously teach the contrary. These difficulties often appall even the most blinded advocate of this fearful delusion. I am very certain that, if those who lean upon the ministers of this error, and look for salvation without holiness of heart, because certain men assure them that all will be well in the life that is to come, could know the misgivings of a Universalist preacher, the objections that surround him, and the suspicions that he whispers to a confidential friend, they would feel that the risk was great in trusting such a doctrine.

The peril is fearful. There could not be a more eloquent or impressive lecture upon Universalism, than a collection of the confessions of its advocates.

Before my mind was much disturbed in respect to the *truth* of Universalism, — before I seriously questioned the soundness of the arguments set forth in its defence, — I met with difficulties which made my ministry a painful one, and the support of my faith no easy task. I will name some of them.

I. DIFFICULTIES ARISING FROM THE DOCTRINES OF UNIVERSALISM.

Universalism in this country has had several fathers. Mr. Murray is the father of Universalism as it was; Mr. Ballou, the father of it as it is. Mr. Ballou informs us that he was led to adopt his views of religion by reading a Deistical book. By denying future punishment and the divinity of Jesus Christ, he, in 1818, changed the whole fabric of Universalism; and has earned the title of originator of its present form and character.

Though Mr. Ballou is the author of modern Universalism, it was not through his influence that it has displaced the system of Murray. It is well known that Mr. Ballou is a man of little reading, and limited in his knowledge of books. He had, at the beginning of his public life, barely a common education. And though, after preaching several years, he began to study English grammar, any one who hears him will be convinced that he must have abandoned the attempt soon after the commencement. He had neither

personal influence nor intellectual power enough to make his notions popular. Though he published them to the world, they met with little attention among his associates.

About this time, Walter Balfour professed conversion to Universalism. He adopted Mr. Ballou's sentiments, and carried them out with a bold hand. He went far beyond Mr. Ballou, and asserted such strange doctrines, and unheard-of notions, that he claims a place among the fathers of Universalism.

He professed to be a scholar. He talked about Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, to such a degree, that his associates, unable to decide whether he was a learned man or a pretender, granted his claims, and shared his praise.

Mr. Balfour was brought up in the doctrines of the church of Scotland. He renounced them, however, and became a Haldanite, and as such came to this country, as a missionary, to enlighten the descendants of the Puritans in relation to the Bible, and to do the work of a missionary upon the soil of New England. He did not visit this country as a man of distinction. He was not, as Universalists represent, a popular Orthodox preacher. He was an open-communion Baptist, and the body of which he was a member, was feeble and almost unknown.

Soon after he reached this country, he introduced himself to the late Rev. Dr. Morse of Charlestown, and made known the purpose of his mission. Dr. Morse gave Mr. Balfour little encouragement. Soon after his arrival, Mr. Balfour changed his ground, and

avowed himself a Congregationalist. Still he failed to secure that position which he thought his talents ought to command. He soon left the Congregationalists, and announced himself a Baptist. But his standing among the Baptists was not what he wished; and he left them in a short time. He next became a Puritan Baptist, celebrated the communion every Sabbath, and washed his disciples' feet. Making a hurried descent through Unitarianism and Restorationism, he came down to Universalism; and was embraced by Universalists as one of the greatest and most learned of men.

Before he *avowed* himself to be a Universalist, Mr. Balfour addressed a series of anonymous letters to Rev. Prof. Stuart, professing to be in doubt upon some of the great doctrines of the gospel, and asking for light. These letters appearing in a Universalist print, endorsed by no responsible name, and bearing internal evidence that the writer was a confirmed Universalist, as no doubt he was, they received no attention from Prof. Stuart.

Indeed, no one supposed, at the time, that the writer expected any notice from the distinguished person whom he addressed; the whole being evidently intended for effect. He then threw off his disguise, and addressed Prof. Stuart over his own name. But he commanded less attention, if possible, when known, than when engaged as an anonymous writer. All by whom he desired to be noticed, knew the man too well to waste upon him either intellect or ink. He gained his object, however. He came to Univer-

salists as a mighty man; as one whom his former brethren dare not attack, and whom Prof. Stuart could not answer.

Claiming to be a learned man, as indeed he was, in comparison with his present associates, Mr. Balfour gave a new aspect to Universalism; and so changed it, that, when it came from his hands, it retained but little of the form it had received from Mr. Murray, the father of the system.

Mr. Balfour contended that no such place as hell ever existed. The being of Satan he expunged from the Bible. The immortality of the soul he denied. He taught that all punishment was limited to this life, that all consciousness ceased with the death of the body, and that men would know nothing after death, till the general resurrection, when they would be created over again.

When I began my public life, the views of Mr. Balfour were generally received by the sect to which I belonged. The divinity of Christ was a theme of ridicule. Future retribution was laughed at as a relic of heathenism. The immortality of the soul was a thing that existed only in the imagination. The Bible was allowed to be an inspired book, provided it taught Universalism; while it was a common remark from the pulpit, that it would be unworthy of confidence if it contained any sentiment inconsistent with the salvation of all men.

I embraced the form of Universalism then prevalent. I was a Humanitarian. The immortality of the soul, the native depravity of man, the apostasy and the ruin of our race, *the plenary* inspiration of the Bible,

and future punishment, were all set aside by my teachers, and were rejected by myself. There were parts of the Bible that seemed to teach doctrines different from those which I had espoused. But I relieved my mind with the supposition that all systems had their difficulties, and that mine had fewer than others.

In the course of my ministry, as I became familiar with men and opinions, I could not but be impressed with the fact that a great many wise and good men received the doctrines which I rejected. Many of them stood high as men of sense and sound discernment. These men would be confided in, as to other matters. How, then, could they receive doctrines which, to my mind, were so contrary to reason? How could they discover their faith in the Bible, when I knew it taught no such thing? I thought much, read much, and was much perplexed upon this subject. Some parts of the Bible seemed to be built upon the fact that the soul is immortal. Other parts seemed to assert the divinity of the Redeemer. There was much, too, that intimated that this life is one of trial, and that its actions will decide the endless destiny of man.

Though the principles of interpretation which I brought to the Bible helped me to get over these difficulties in a great measure, yet in all cases I could not satisfy myself. And, besides, those principles obliterated some of the most obvious truths. The same reasoning that blotted from the Bible eternal death, also blotted out endless life. When I extinguished the *fires of hell*, I put out, at the same time, the light of

heaven. When I had proved that Satan had no existence, the same arguments would annihilate the being of God, and make atheism the true faith.

From this perplexity I sought and found relief in the following manner: Some years ago, I had presented to me a book, containing the studies pursued at the Andover Theological Seminary, together with the doctrines there taught, and a reference to the works in which each doctrine was explained and defended.

Taking the book one day from my library, I resolved to investigate this subject, and see what the advocates of Orthodoxy could say in its defence. I had access to a very valuable theological library, and availed myself of its ample stores to obtain information as to those doctrines which have so long composed the faith of the church of Christ. I had no design or desire to embrace the creed I was about to examine. But the world seemed full of ideas about the fall of angels and men, and of the doctrines of depravity, atonement, regeneration, and eternal judgment. It was my desire to know upon what these and kindred doctrines were based; to inform myself in respect to the amount of evidence derived from the Bible in their support.

For some time I was engaged in this work. As I proceeded, I was astonished to find how grossly caricatured the doctrines of grace had been, and how much reason and Scripture were on their side. I often found those despised sentiments sustained by an amount of evidence which I was unable to remove.

As the result of this inquiry, my views on most of the important doctrines of the gospel were materially changed. Indeed, from the commencement of my

ministry, my views had undergone a gradual and imperceptible change, till the grace of God led me to embrace fully the doctrines of the cross.

II. DIFFICULTIES ARISING FROM THE IRRELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF UNIVERSALIST CONGREGATIONS.

Among those who composed the societies of Universalists, I have ever found a general dislike to religious duties and serious things. This seemed to be the uniting bond. To cast off fear, and to restrain prayer, was the great thing to be gained by a profession of Universalism. In the congregations with which I have had an acquaintance, I never found a family that observed the reading of the Bible as an act of devotion, or had regular family worship. And I have never found settled religious principle among those calling themselves Universalists. Not only have I never found devout reverence springing from the system, but none can live in it. I have observed it a fact invariably occurring, that, when a Universalist becomes serious and thoughtful, he will at once leave the Universalist meeting. And when a pious man embraces that system, he will abandon his habits of devotion in changing his faith. Men peculiar for their habits of private and family prayer, and for a serious study of the Bible, if they embrace Universalism, become at once as peculiar for the neglect of these religious duties.

The great purpose of those who unite in Universalist societies, is not to make themselves better, and to *throw* around themselves new restraints; it is not that

the Sabbath may be the better observed, and men reformed, converted, and made holy. But the great purpose is to put down Orthodoxy. All preaching that gives satisfaction tends to this, and all effort is directed to this point. If a minister, in place of preaching against religion, preaches against the sins of his people, he is at once censured as having "travelled out of the record."

Few make the daily reading of the Bible their dependence; few rely on its teachings for the support of Universalism. All its believers place great reliance upon the periodicals devoted to Universalism, to defend the system, and to explain away difficult texts. I have long been of opinion that no people, not even the Catholics, take their opinions so much upon trust as do the Universalists. Every where I have found a looseness of principle, and a disposition to ridicule serious things, that shocked my mind. Men seemed to value Universalism for the license it gave; for its power to cast off restraint, and remove from the conscience the sanctions of religion. When settled in Salem, I once attempted to persuade a member of my congregation to join the church. He declined. I urged him to do so, on the ground that for many years he had been a professed Universalist, and, as such, believed that all had a right to commune. His reply was emphatic: "For me to join your church would be carrying the joke a little too far!"

The fact that many of my ministerial associates professed to have little confidence in the truth of the system, or in its good moral tendency, was another source of difficulty. In private social meetings, ministers do

confess to each other that there are objections to Universalism which they cannot remove. I have heard old men point out the sophistry of an argument used in defence of the system by a young man, and then employ the same argument, when preaching on the same subject. Often have I heard a zealous Universalist say, "Our Orthodox friends do not know our weak points so well as we know them ourselves."

Among them also was a great amount of skepticism. Some denied the existence of angels; some, a future life. Others rejected a part of the Old Testament, and a part of the New. The idea that God answers prayer was scoffed at. Many observed the form, in public service, because it was common so to do; while all admitted that it was the most difficult part of the exercises. A student of Universalist divinity was asked by his father, who was a Christian, if he prayed. His reply was, "No, sir, not yet. I shall begin to preach soon; *and then, I suppose, I must come to it.*"

III. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE DEPORTMENT OF UNIVERSALIST MINISTERS.

Many preachers, those the most popular, allow that they preach for money; and that, unless well paid, they would not preach at all. A near relation of mine, a Universalist minister, has confessed to me that he preached to get his bread; that his preaching did not reform men, neither did he expect it would; that he was well paid for his preaching, and sometimes his hearers were pleased, and sometimes they were offend-

ed, and swore. But they paid him promptly, and the rest was their concern.

Among no body of men can be found, I presume, so much ill-will, jealousy, and bad feeling, as may be found among the advocates of Universalism. They profess great love for all men; and for each other, in a special manner. But it is needful to go behind the curtain, to become familiar with the character of this good-will which preachers bear to each other, and of the brotherly love found in their borders.

Although associated with them twelve years, I never heard the subject of personal religion introduced in a meeting of Universalist teachers as a theme of conversation, or any topic designed to improve the understanding or mend the heart. But impure and indecent jests, low and offensive stories, remarks that would rule a man out of any respectable drawing-room in the country, together with petty scandal, and criticism of no friendly character upon some absent brother, make up the conversation of Universalist preachers when in company with each other. Some few of us used to regret this state of things, and talk of it. But any attempt to check it would only have brought us under the suspicion of all who were engaged in it.

IV. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE FACT, THAT BUT FEW UNIVERSALIST PROFESSORS ARE CONFIRMED IN THE DOCTRINE.

In a society of professed Universalists, you will find two classes. The first consists of those who have no faith in revelation, but support Universalist

preaching, because, in their opinion, it is better than nothing, and because its chief work is to put down Orthodoxy. In this class should be ranked those who avouch themselves to be "Universalists, if they are any thing," and who have little concern in it any way. If Universalism is in the Bible, it will be well with them. If not, they will reject the Bible. A second class is of those who are called Universalists, and perhaps call themselves so. They attend a Universalist meeting, because their friends do; or because a husband or a brother desires their attendance; or because they have not yet made up their mind in relation to what the Bible does teach. They wish Universalism to be true; hope it is so, and try to believe it. Such attend upon preaching, to have their doubts removed. They will read Universalist papers, argue in defence of the system, and attempt, by removing doubts in the mind of others, to remove their own.

I have been beyond measure surprised to find persons in my congregation, whom I regarded as decided Universalists, who would confess to me that they had doubts of the truth of the doctrine; and that, when they looked forward to death, they were fearful that the exchange of worlds would be for the worse, and not for the better. Others would allow that a moral change must take place in them before they died, if they were to be blessed; and yet try to persuade themselves that Universalism is true, and that, though such a change were not experienced, it would be well with them in the future. Whenever you find a Universalist restless and uneasy, full of

dispute and argument, always ready for debate, and challenging every one to a discussion, you may rest assured that you are in the presence of one who has serious doubts as to the truth of Universalism.

When, in my intercourse with Universalists, I met so many wavering and doubting, whom I had considered to be the most firm and decided, and so many preachers confessing the existence of objections against Universalism which they could not remove, calling in question the relevancy of important proof-texts urged in favor of the system, and suggesting difficulties that no ingenuity could remove, — I found it for a long time no easy work to defend my faith.

V. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE FACT, THAT REASONING WHICH SATISFIED OTHERS, DID NOT SATISFY MYSELF.

Persons would often visit me when troubled with doubts upon the doctrine of Universalism. They would desire me to remove an objection, or explain a text of Scripture. I have often succeeded in removing their doubts, and have sent them away satisfied, while the matter was by no means cleared up to my own mind. Frequently a train of reasoning in defence of the salvation of all men, which, at the time, appeared conclusive, would be swept away by some apparently slight circumstance. An incident will illustrate this. I preached once in Brattleboro', Vt., and attempted to prove Universalism from the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt. I made the people of Israel a type of all mankind; and from the facts that all were redeemed from Egypt, that all

passed through the sea, and all joined in the song of deliverance, I attempted to show that all mankind would, in like manner, be redeemed from sin and the grave.

The argument was satisfactory to my own mind, and was received with marks of favor by my friends. The next day, in a company of some of my friends, the subject was introduced, and great satisfaction was expressed with the ingenious and conclusive argument which was presented the day before. A young lady, of distinguished intelligence and piety, who was present, thought the argument not quite so conclusive in favor of the salvation of all men as was supposed; and intimated that the history from which the argument was drawn, proved any thing rather than the salvation of all men. Confident that I was correct, and anxious to win over my fair opponent to my faith, I requested her to sustain her assertions. With modest decision she remarked, that the salvation of all Israel was admitted; but *Pharaoh and his hosts were destroyed;* so all the Israel of God will at last be more than conquerors, while those "who obey not God will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." "Now," added the young lady, "you must allow, that, if the history proves any thing in relation to the future, it proves the certain destruction of the enemies of God; and as Moses and his brethren could sing praise to God for deliverance in full view of the destruction of the king and his numerous host, so may the redeemed sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, though many of God's enemies shall perish."

This unexpected refutation of my argument mortified and silenced me. And though, once or twice afterward, I ventured to use the same argument, I never got rid of the impression made upon my mind at that time.

VI. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE WANT OF SANCTIONS, TO ENFORCE THE PRACTICAL DUTIES OF LIFE.

I felt, while preaching, like a lawgiver attempting to enforce among the dissolute obedience to a law, to the violation of which no penalty was attached. I could urge men to repent of sin, to reform, to love God and serve him. But the answer would come back, Suppose we do not choose to do so; what then? In reply, I could only urge that it was better not to sin, that the way of the transgressor is hard, and that it was more conducive to happiness to serve God, than to rebel against him. Upon the countenance of my hearers, I seemed to read the inquiry, Suppose we differ from you, and prefer the service of sin, and choose to rebel against God; what will be the consequence? The only answer that I could give was,—"Nothing! You had better not live in sin, but if you do, you will be saved."

VII. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE NUMBER AND CHARACTER RESPECTIVELY OF THOSE WHO REJECT AND THOSE WHO DEFEND UNIVERSALISM.

Every one knows that some of the profoundest scholars that have ever lived, have been in the church of Christ. Their splendid talents, their lofty and

solid attainments, have been devoted to the investigation and the expounding of the truths of the Bible. In all ages of the church since the ascension of Jesus, the entire ministry, with a few exceptions, have found eternal death to be the threatened doom of all who die in impenitence. And the persons excepted in comparison with the others, are not so numerous, as those who have denied the existence of God, in comparison with those who have received it.

To believe that no such doctrines are found in the Bible as the great mass of the Christian world have found in it, is to impeach their discernment. To presume that they knew that there were no such doctrines in the Bible as they profess, is to impeach their honesty. In either case, if Universalism be true, the Christian world, for eighteen centuries, have not only been incompetent or dishonest judges of divine truth, but the Bible ceases to be a safe book, and no man can consider it as a true guide. If it has misled the world for eighteen hundred years, if it has deceived the most learned and judicious in respect to its teachings, and turned astray those who have sought with diligence and prayer to know God's will that they might do it, then it is not what it professes to be — a light shining in a dark place, an unerring guide, giving such plain instruction, that the unlettered man may by it be made wise unto salvation.

If congress should pass a law, which, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, should mislead the people of the United States, and if those deceived should be

the best part of the community, — that part which had studied the law that they might know the will of congress and obey it, — there is not an intelligent man in the world who would not spurn that statute as unmeaning or demoralizing.

On the other hand, Universalism is a modern affair. The man yet lives who originated the system now called Universalism; and the father of the first system of Universalism in America, has not been dead fifty years. No society of Universalists existed prior to the year 1785. It is not with Universalism as with some other doctrines. No man can hold it, and at the same time receive any doctrine in common with Evangelical Christianity. For Universalism denies not only *one* doctrine, but every doctrine which has been peculiar to the Christian church, since the ascension of its Founder.

It needs no argument to prove that no class of men ever before advanced such doctrines as distinguish Universalism, and at the same time professed faith in the Bible. The advocates of Universalism have given to the winds, as idle talk, the learning and research of centuries. As I have already shown, they deny the learning, the discernment, or the honesty, of all good men, who for eighteen hundred years have enriched biblical science, and left monuments of their piety, zeal, and learning, to us their children. And not only so, but, to defend Universalism, it must be asserted that the fathers of the church deserve censure rather than praise, as having done great injury in the department of biblical criticism. Their writings, based upon eternal rewards and punishments, are monuments

of folly, they having overlooked the obvious meaning of the Bible, if Universalism be true.

Now, the world has a right to expect learning the most profound, and research the most extensive, from those who despise the wisdom of the fathers. Such men must be prepared amply to compensate the world by the vast additions which they bring to biblical science, for the sacrifice they demand. These persons, who have upturned all past research, who have declared that all was wrong till they arose to enlighten the world, ought only to have arrived at their positions by the most learned and patient investigation. But what have Universalists done in the department of biblical knowledge? what additions have they made? what learned and valuable works have they sent forth to throw light upon the Bible? The reply shall be given in a few words.

Mr. Kneeland, when a Universalist, made a translation of the New Testament that should teach his faith. He completed his work, and, by the light of it, ran off into atheism.

Mr. Ballou has written a work intended to be critical, called "Notes on the Parables;" and, in illustrating such passages as the following, "So shall it be in the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth," (*Matt.* xiii. 49, 50) Mr. Ballou very gravely tells his readers that this means to cast men into the love of God, to purify and save them.

In later times, Mr. Whittemore, conscious of the

failure of Mr. Ballou's attempt, has given to the world a book, which is also entitled "Notes on the Parables." Unlike Mr. Ballou, he allows that the passages above cited, and kindred texts, do indicate the punishment in reserve for the enemies of Christ. But with a gravity equal to that of Mr. Ballou himself, Mr. Whittemore informs his readers, that all these threatenings had their fulfilment some forty years after they were spoken, when certain Jews were cast into a valley on the south side of the city of Jerusalem. (*Notes on Parables*, pp. 44—52.)

Mr. Balfour has written three professedly critical books, in which he has made quite a dazzling display of learning. But it is just such a display as any man could make, who knows the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, and could obtain a Hebrew and a Greek lexicon!

The design of Mr. Balfour's first book, is to prove that there is no hell; of the second, to show that there is no devil; and of the third, to prove that man has not an immortal soul. Add to this list sundry tracts, newspaper articles, and essays in periodicals, and you have at hand the learned researches of the Universalist ministry.

But what ability have they to make contributions to biblical literature? The community have little acquaintance with the character and qualifications of a Universalist minister. In the place where one resides, he is, as a general thing, unnoticed and unknown, save by the members of his own sect. The system is so absurd, so manifestly at war with common sense, so fraught with disaster and ruin to all

that is dear to man, that there most justly clings to it so disagreeable an odor, that moral and sober men, as well as the religious, desire no connection with its advocates. All the reputation, therefore, that the ministry of Universalism enjoys, it derives from the profession itself. It is supposed that a minister is a man of education, a moral man, and a gentleman; and knowing nothing about the Universalist ministry, or about the moral and intellectual qualifications required of candidates, the community are surprised to learn, that a man may retail liquor by the glass, use profane language, and be an open infidel, and yet be a Universalist minister in good standing. People are astounded when they learn, that a minister guilty of bigamy is declared to have committed no crime against morality or religion, and that this declaration is made, too, by an assembled council of Universalist preachers. Men can scarcely credit the statement, that an acquaintance with English grammar is not required in a candidate for ordination; and that a man may arise from a shoe-bench, or a work-bench, to-day, ignorant of grammar, unable to write a page of composition correctly, and in six weeks become an accredited Universalist preacher. Yet such is the truth. The ministry of Universalism, while I write, holds just such men as I have described.

On this subject, Mr. H. Ballou, 2d, who is good authority, says: — "Whatever is the amount of good *material* in our denomination, it is still a fact, which no well-informed member will deny, and which should be held up before us in the plainest terms, that,

with respect to general *culture*, we are behind most of the other sects. We confess that, for ourselves, we do not believe that Universalism is thus to be identified with ignorance." (*Expositor*, *March*, 1839, p. 100.)

In the Hudson River Association of Universalists, a few years since, an attempt was made to establish a rule, requiring of candidates for ordination, the study of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, for the space of six months, under some Universalist preacher; no theological study being demanded. The introduction of the resolution produced a commotion that, for a time, threatened the existence of the Association. It was declared to be "absolutely *useless*" to possess such qualifications. It was said to be "one of the abominations of partialism." Some of the ablest ministers threatened to "leave the order" if the resolution were not withdrawn. But the excitement went beyond the bounds of the Association, and the periodicals expressed their indignation at the rule proposed. The editor of one of the most widely circulated Universalist papers says, in respect to grammar, "*We do consider this an absurd requisition for the candidate for the ministry, particularly when many of our ablest preachers could not even now pass the required examination.*" (*Mag. and Adv.* iii. p. 342.) Mr. Andrews says, "Many of our most *popular* and *useful* preachers have no pretensions of that sort; and are, in fact, unable to write a sermon correctly, that is, without gross violation of the most common principles of rhetoric and English grammar." (*Gospel Anchor*, ii. p. 141.) Suppose an ignorant, unlettered man should arise in some obscure

town in this country, and call in question the universally-received opinions of the great principles of the Constitution of the United States; scoff at and reject the expositions of the most able and accomplished statesmen who have expounded that instrument; talk of improvement, of the increase of light, of the progress of society, as an apology for introducing his opinions, and avow doctrines upon government not only at war with all that the constitution was supposed to teach, but such as were never before advanced; would his notions be regarded for one moment? No! A serious consideration of them would not be entertained an instant by any intelligent mind.

Yet such is the attitude of Universalism. Its originators and defenders have a poor claim to scholarship, while its "*ablest*" preachers, and those the "*most useful*," "cannot pass an examination in English grammar." These are the men who wish to be credited when all the world is against them. These are they who ask you to leave the way of holiness as the path of salvation, and to lean upon them and their teaching, while they announce to the wicked, as was done of old, "Ye shall not surely die." This consideration makes the defence of Universalism a difficult task.

VIII. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE RECENT DATE OF UNIVERSALISM.

Error is as old as creation. That instruction which causeth to err, and leads down to death, began in Eden as soon as God's law was proclaimed. But the

peculiar form of error known as Universalism is a modern affair. Upon no subject are many persons more deceived. The *present form* of Universalism can date back no farther than 1818, when Hosea Ballou avowed the doctrines that now compose the system. I say *its present form*, for the system has never been the same in any two periods of time. The doctrines of Universalism; the arguments offered in its favor; the expositions of Scripture, which distinguish it in one age, are set aside in the next; and other doctrines, and other expositions, conflicting and contradictory, take their place. An argument advanced against Universalism in one age, will not touch the system in the next. Nothing connected with Universalism is permanent, except its moral results; these remain unchanged, — always destructive, every where licentious and fatal. Mr. Murray is called "the father of Universalism;" but not one doctrine that entered into the system, as defended by Murray, enters into it now. To this subject I shall devote more attention in my lecture upon the moral results of Universalism.

No one pretends that the present form of Universalism runs back any farther than 1818; while the system, under any form, can date back no farther than to John Murray, who is styled the "father of Universalism." (*Mod. Hist. of Univ.* p. 318.) The child is evidently no older than the parent, and Mr. Murray did not commence his public life till 1770.

I am not ignorant of the fact that Universalists attempt to show that Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, and some of the early Fathers, believed in Univer-

salism. But, Universalists themselves being judges, they have no claim upon these men.

Mr. H. Ballou, 2d, in his "Ancient History of Universalism," cites Origen as a Universalist. But his own testimony proves that Origen did not believe in the salvation of all men. He held that all souls that have lived, or ever will live, were created at one time, and were all equal; that all will be ransomed from hell, and stand as at the beginning. But while the damned will be restored, others will fall from purity, and take their place; and as the once lost ascend to heaven, the once blest descend to hell; and those restored can again fall, and be lost. Thus the soul would alternately experience the joy of heaven and the woe of hell. Origen believed that hell would always be full, and its fires never cease to burn. Such was his Universalism, amounting only to the doctrine of the migration of souls, from a place of pain to a place of bliss, and back again. (*Anc. Hist. Univ.* pp. 95, 99, 114, 156.)

Clemens Alexandrinus was no more a Universalist than was Origen. He believed that to some the future life would be one of probation. He taught that all who died without a knowledge of Christ, would have space for repentance; implying that others would not. That he believed that all those would repent who have space for repentance, he does not assert. (*Anc. Hist. Univ.* pp. 71, 72.)

Universalism, as a system, we repeat, is a modern affair, not yet THIRTY YEARS OF AGE. Can any reflecting man believe that God would give us a revelation, and the meaning of that revelation be unre-

revealed eighteen hundred years? or that the true doctrines of the Bible were unknown till Mr. Murray landed in this country in 1770?

IX. DIFFICULTY ON THE GROUND THAT UNIVERSALISM IS OPEN TO THE SAME OBJECTION THAT IS URGED AGAINST ATHEISM.

It is a strong presumptive proof that there is a God, that no nation or tribe of the human family has rejected the belief of his existence. As with atheism, so with the doctrine of Universalism. Not only have the entire mass of the Christian world, with few exceptions, rejected it, but also all the nations of the earth. Find a nation, and you find them in possession of faith in a Supreme Power, and faith in the doctrine of future retribution. Even among those who, from habits and customs, might have been disposed to limit all suffering to this world, you find the most fearful descriptions of future woe, and the most "fearful looking for of judgment." If Universalism were true, it would be written some where. God is not the God that Universalism represents him to be, if it is his purpose to save all men; for he has created us with a faith in future punishment, and written upon the conscience of no nation the doctrine of universal salvation. The patriarchs knew it not. Inspired men of old wrote of the misery of the damned. (*Luke* xvi. 29, 31.) The chosen people of God, instructed by his inspired prophets, have ever believed that eternal death is the doom of the wicked. The entire mass of the Christian world, with those few exceptions that hardly deserve a notice, have

found the same truth written, not only in the New Testament, but also "in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms." And all the nations of the earth, savage or civilized, bond or free, enlightened or degraded, have alike, with one consent, rejected the doctrine that all men will be saved. We say that atheism is false, because the common sense of all nations has rejected it. All nations have rejected Universalism, which, by the same rule, is false.

X. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE OBVIOUS APPLICATION OF THE DESCRIPTIONS OF FALSE TEACHERS, IN THE BIBLE, TO THE ADVOCATES OF UNIVERSALISM.

The Bible abounds with declarations such as these: "Let no man deceive you;" "Take heed how ye hear;" "Be not deceived, God is not mocked;" "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing." There are two reasons why the followers of Christ should be on their guard. The first is, that deceivers never come in their proper garb. They appear to be what they are not. They take the name, and use the words, of Christ only to deceive. If the disciples trust to appearances, they will be misled. A second reason for vigilance is, that, if they are deceived, and follow after error, they will as surely be devoured by a wolf in sheep's clothing, as if they had voluntarily given themselves up to destruction. The man who takes a cup of poison supposing it to be a cup of health, is destroyed as certainly as if he intended to take his own life.

You cannot place before any intelligent mind the character of false teachers, as exhibited in the Bible,

without leaving the impression that you have reference to the advocates of Universalism. For their business, and the business of false teachers in all ages of the world, is one. They deny the threatenings of God's word; and cause men to believe that, though they rebel against God, and live in impenitence, God will not do as he has threatened.

What was the work of Satan in Eden? Was it not to prove that God would not be true to his word? and that, though Eve were to sin, she would "not surely die"? In the days of the prophets, the seducer was found. And what then was his design? Was it not to "cry, Peace, Peace, when there was no peace"? to heal slightly the hurt of the people of God? with lies to make the heart of the righteous sad? to strengthen the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life? Let any intelligent person read the thirteenth chapter of Ezekiel, and he cannot resist the conclusion, that it is graphically descriptive of Universalist preaching.

When God's prophets threatened war and calamity, the false teacher cried peace. When the whole nation was sick unto death, he proclaimed health. When the Almighty expostulated with our guilty race, saying, "Turn ye, for why will ye die?" the impostor raised his voice in opposition, saying, "Be not alarmed. God is good. Ye shall not surely die!"

In the days of the apostles, it was the usual device of the false teacher to appear as a disciple, that he might devour the flock. Paul says, "Be not de-

ceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." (*Gal.* vi. 7.) Thus early were false teachers employed in deceiving men, and teaching that God could be mocked; and that a man might sin, and escape the penalty! Peter, after announcing the destruction of the universe, informs us that scoffers would arise, denying the judgment.

What Satan taught in Eden; what his servants announced in the days of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; what the enemies of the truth taught when Paul, Peter, and other apostles, were upon the earth,—the same do Universalists now teach. The substance of those delusions which lay scattered upon the surface of time, since the first transgression in Eden till the Scriptures were completed, may now be found imbodied in one form. In 1818, they were gathered up, and moulded into the system now called Universalism. For the great business of the system is, to explain away the threatenings of the Bible, and teach men that the menaced death of the soul, the warnings to the wicked, the denunciations of "hell-fire," "eternal damnation," "everlasting punishment," "losing the soul," being "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," all are figures of speech, or Oriental metaphors.

The point is proved, that the descriptions in the Bible of false teachers and their doctrines, are adapted to describe Universalism and its advocates. And our duty in relation to perverters of the gospel, is clearly pointed out. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him

God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 *John* 10, 11.)

No Evangelical minister hesitates to apply this to the preachers of Universalism. He believes that Universalism is "another gospel." And guided by this passage, he cannot receive them as ministers, nor in any way countenance their claims. Universalist preachers understand this. They know that they are not regarded as Christians, and that as false teachers they are excluded from the pulpits and the communion of Christians. They feel this; they complain of it.

But a Universalist preacher cannot apply this text to Evangelical ministers. He dare not close his pulpit against them on the ground that they preach error, and that he is commanded not to bid such "God speed." Any Universalist preacher would gladly exchange with Orthodox ministers. And should a Universalist teacher decline an exchange, his people would not sustain him.

To quote a text from the Bible that describes false teachers, calls up to every one who hears it, the advocates of Universalism. So obvious is the application, so true the description.

XI. DIFFICULTY ARISING FROM THE FACT THAT THE BIBLE IS NOT WRITTEN AS A TEXT-BOOK UPON UNIVERSALISM WOULD BE WRITTEN.

When it was my business to explain the Bible in harmony with Universalism, I used often to think that I could write a revelation and defence of Universalism

which would not require that laborious explanation which the Bible must receive to make it teach that doctrine. When I read a chapter in the course of public worship, I was very careful about my selection. Many parts I thought unsafe to read, unless accompanied by an explanation; and some I never ventured to read at all.

If men would apply those principles of common sense to this subject, which they apply to others, they could never be the victims of Universalism.

The history of Napoleon Bonaparte is before the world. His ability as a warrior, his splendid military triumphs, are acknowledged by all nations. Suppose that some one should arise, and affirm him to be a coward, ignorant of the first principles of military tactics, and, when at the head of his army, the flower of France, and the best disciplined in the world, was frequently routed by a handful of stragglers gathered from the streets and fields;—who, I ask, would credit him?

Or suppose that some one were to write a commentary upon the life of Washington, attempting to prove him the enemy of his country; calling upon the world to give up their long-cherished and universally-received opinion of his character, as the friend and savior of his country; and contending that the evidence by which these novel opinions were sustained, was to be found upon every page of his life;—who, I ask again, would credit such a monstrous and slanderous assertion?

And yet these imaginary cases afford but a faint exhibition of the preposterous claims of Universalism.

For it opposes the faith of the entire Christian world. The learned and the pious, ever since the ascension of Jesus, have found, plainly written in the Bible, the truth that all are bound to the judgment, that all who die in sin are exposed to punishment after death, and that this life is given to prepare for another.

On the other hand, a few unlettered men stand up, after the religion of Christ has been established for eighteen hundred years, and say that the Bible reveals no such doctrine as the learned and pious have found in it; nay, teach that our race have nothing to fear after death; but that, reach the grave as they may, the evil and the good will have one resurrection, and one destiny beyond it.

Bring, then, to this subject those principles of common sense which you would apply to the charge of cowardice in Napoleon, or treachery in Washington, and you will be safe from the delusion of Universalism.

Such, then, were some of the difficulties in the way of defending Universalism. Its doctrines strike at the root of all Christian faith and piety. They are so near atheism and infidelity, that both of them can take refuge under their wing. The congregations which attend upon its ministry are irreligious, and wish so to remain.

Many preachers have little confidence in the system, and privately admit their inability to remove objections that are urged against their system. Their intercourse is distinguished for any thing, rather than good-will and brotherly love. Few of the professors of Universalism are at ease, or confirmed in their

faith. A preacher can more easily remove doubts from the minds of others than from his own; and he is frequently found using arguments in which he has very little confidence. He has no sanction with which to urge home truth upon the heart. And then, when he remembers the names, the number, the character, the standing of those who, in all ages, have rejected Universalism; and the character, talents, and standing, of those who defend it, and their writings on the subject; and when he adds to all, the modern date of the system,—we have a mass of difficulties not easily overcome.

These difficulties have been thrown across my path; they have troubled and perplexed me. They have had the same effect upon others, and I offer this as another reason for renouncing Universalism.

I might swell the list, and add to the number almost *ad infinitum*. Universalism has no fixed principles of interpretation. Ten men will give ten different and contrary interpretations to one text, to remove a present difficulty. The advocates of it believe or reject future punishment, receive or discard the atonement, as the circumstances in which they are placed seem to require.

At times, these considerations have pressed upon me, as I have stood in my desk, and cast my eyes upon my congregation, and felt that all, in a great measure, were resting their immortal interests upon my preaching. When these doubts and difficulties have weighed upon me, I could not but tremble in view of the fact, that, if this life were one of probation, and through my instrumentality was wasted,

and if these souls were ruined, and their sandy foundation were to fail in the day of trial, *their* loss would be great, and my portion at last must be with the deceivers and the deceived.

Allow me to ask, in conclusion, Can such a system as Universalism be of God? Is it not a delusion of the most appalling kind? Does not he who trusts it injure his own soul? Fly, then, all of you, from such delusion, so fatal, so deceptive. Let not Satan, the enemy of souls, secure you as a subject of his dark dominions. If he has in any measure got hold of you by means of a system of deception, turn to Jesus; "if God, peradventure, will give you repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." Fly, then, from error, lest you perish. Fly from sin to holiness. from death to life.

LECTURE III.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM THE THREATENINGS OF THE BIBLE.

2 COR. v. 11.

KNOWING, THEREFORE, THE TERROR OF THE LORD, WE PERSUADE MEN.

When resolved to review the whole subject of the final destiny of mankind, I set myself down to a candid, critical, and prayerful examination of all that the Bible teaches on this momentous question. With the threatenings of the Bible I thought myself familiar. I knew the chapter and verse wherein each of those testimonies might be found, which are supposed to refute Universalism. I could recite them without the Bible. I also had an interpretation for each of them; and felt prepared to defend my sentiments against all objections drawn from the Word of God.

But now, as I looked at them, they assumed an aspect that they never before seemed to wear. There was a solemnity about them, which to my mind had never before rested upon them. I approached them, not with a design to explain them away; not to see how I could make them harmonize with Universalism. I had no wish to trifle with the Bible. I

DURST NOT DO IT. In some measure I felt the responsibility of my position, and the danger of my hands being dyed in the blood of souls. I went to this work with a trembling spirit of supplication.

In reviewing the threatenings of the Bible, I did so as a Universalist. This book, I said to myself, sustains my faith. Nothing, therefore, will be found in the Bible which cannot be easily explained in harmony with Universalism. If this system be true, the Savior was its Author: he came to reveal the salvation of all men, to enforce it upon men. But the people to whom the Savior came and preached, were far from believing in this doctrine. Their belief in endless punishment is as well known as their belief in the existence of God. They declared, openly and constantly, that impenitent men were exposed to eternal death. This sentiment was as universal among the generation to which the Savior was sent, as their faith in a future life. No matter from what source they derived this opinion, the fact that they held it cannot be questioned by any student of the Bible; and is fully admitted in the writings of the Universalists. As a Universalist, I must regard this doctrine as an error, fraught with evils of an appalling nature, being at once dishonorable to God and injurious to man. Moreover, the Savior could do nothing towards inducing the Jews to receive Universalism, until the idea of endless death should be removed from their minds. As a teacher sent from God, he will speak as decidedly upon this great evil as Universalists now do.

But when I examined the sacred writings, to see in

what terms the Savior rebuked this sentiment, I was surprised to read no rebuke, no warning, no testimony against it; no, not one! But, on the contrary, the language employed by the Redeemer was most evidently adapted to confirm the Jews in their opinions.

THE PREACHING OF JOHN BAPTIST.

John the Baptist came to herald the Messiah; to prepare the way of the Lord, that the people who believed in the eternity of future punishment might receive the doctrine that all will be saved. As I read the sermon with which his ministry began, it seemed to me that it was not such a sermon as might have been expected under the circumstances.

John commenced his ministry by calling men to repentance, by warning them of "wrath to come," by assuring them that the august Personage whom he came to announce, would burn up the wicked, in the last day, "like chaff in an unquenchable fire." How much instruction of this kind would it take, to convince men that there was no wrath in the future world, no unquenchable fire into which the wicked would be cast?

PREACHING OF CHRIST

The preaching of the divine Redeemer was equally inexplicable upon the same principle. If he was a Universalist, he came to introduce ideas at war with the opinions of the whole world; and not only to teach, but to create them. But so far from asserting,

in direct terms, the salvation of all men, and employing language that would leave no room to doubt his meaning, he used language which has led nine tenths of the Christian world, and those the most competent to judge, to believe that he taught, and designed to teach, that many souls would perish forever.

Let a sermon in defence of Universalism be printed, and a copy thrown into every house in the country; and no difference of opinion would arise in respect to the faith of the author, or the design of the sermon. And should a Universalist preacher send forth to the world a sermon so written, that the great mass of intelligent men in the community would suppose that the writer meant to teach that many of our race would finally be lost, all would regard the writer as destitute of common honesty or common sense.

If Universalism be true, it impeaches either the honesty of the Savior, or his competency to teach. He used language which no Universalist can harmonize with his system; language which none but an insane man would use, if he were a sincere believer in the salvation of all men.

Like his forerunner, Christ began his ministry by calling men to repentance. In his first sermon, he describes the class of men who are blessed and accepted of God; and, by contrast, those also who are cursed and rejected. He adverts to the broad way, through which the thronging multitudes go down to death, and points out the narrow way, in which few travellers are found. He mentions sins, the commission of which exposes men "*to hell-fire*"—"*a fire*

that never shall be quenched." He urges men *to lay up for themselves treasures in heaven*, for so only can they have an inheritance there. He plainly teaches that all who heed not his words will, in the last day, resemble the foolish man who was ruined in the hour of tempest and storm. How many converts would this first sermon of the Savior secure, if now repeated, from place to place, by the advocates of Universalism?

The whole teaching of the Savior was of the same character. A few instances I will produce.

"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear Him which, *after* he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him." (*Matt.* x. 28. *Luke* xii. 5.)

This was always a perplexing text to me, and difficult to harmonize with Universalism. This difficulty all Universalist writers admit. No two of them explain it alike. No interpretation satisfies. The simple fact that Christ warns men to fear God, who can cast the soul into hell *after* the body is destroyed, and cautions them that, as men can commit an act which will forfeit their life, so can they commit sins which will expose the soul to hell, is too apparent to be denied, and too awful to be trifled with. And not only could men commit such sins, and be thus exposed, but some already had done so. This is implied in Christ's exclamation, "*How can ye escape the damnation of hell?*" (*Matt.* xxiii. 33.) Could he

who warns men of some fearful doom *after* the death of the body,—something *more* dreadful than the death of the body,—could he be a Universalist?

"But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." (*Mark* iii. 29.)

The interpretation of Universalists is evasive, when called to explain the penalty of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. They select the language of Matthew, in which the phrase occurs, "neither in this world, neither in the world to come," (xii. 32,) and then attempt to prove that the Savior's meaning is, that the sin under consideration would not be forgiven, either in the Jewish or the Christian age. But not to speak of the absurdity of supposing Christ, who had already ushered in the Christian age in his own person, to be talking to his *disciples* about the Christian dispensation, or age, as yet future,—it does not relieve Universalists at all from their difficulty, even were this point granted them; for the sin against the Holy Ghost being unforgiven, both in the Jewish and the Christian dispensations, those who commit it *must die in their sins*. And those who die in their sins will be excluded from the place to which Christ has gone. (*John* viii. 21.)

But Mark says nothing about any age; he writes that the sin *cannot* be forgiven. His language is emphatic. "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath *never forgiveness*, but is in danger of *eternal* damnation." A man cannot be exposed to that which does not exist. If no such thing as eternal damnation exists, then Christ was a deceiver. If

there is such a damnation, then Universalism is false; hell is not a fable; damnation is eternal; and those who are exposed to it "have *never forgiveness*"—no escape, no deliverance.

The instructions of the Savior in respect to the resurrection of the dead, I found it impossible to explain in harmony with Universalism. I will refer to the language of the Redeemer, as recorded in *John* v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

The interpretation of Universalists is, that this is not a literal, but a moral resurrection; and that the resurrection of damnation is spiritual condemnation. But such an interpretation is absurd. In the first place, it makes the violation of the law and the penalty to be the same thing. The crime and the punishment are one. "They that have done evil" *are already spiritually dead.* This was their crime, and Christ commanded them to believe, and pass from death to life. It was for being spiritually dead that they were to come forth to damnation. According to the Universalist exposition, the crime was spiritual death; and for that crime they were to be punished with spiritual death. Suppose a parent wishes to secure obedience to his command; he informs his children that they must obey him; that his law is just, and its penalty righteous. Do any of them steal? as a punishment, they shall steal. Do any utter falsehood? uttering falsehood shall be their chastisement. And in general,

for every act of disobedience, just such another act shall be added, as a punishment. How long would parental authority be maintained in that family? How much of such discipline would it demand to promote reformation, and preserve peace and good order?

Or suppose a government were to prohibit vice and crime, and threaten the transgressor with the severe displeasure of the authorities, and with certain punishment. Then let it be announced, that in all cases the crime and the punishment will be identical; that all acts of insubordination will be punished by other acts of the same kind; that robbery and murder will be avenged by compelling the guilty to pursue their unhallowed employment, and dip their hands in the blood of other victims. Who could endure such mockery of justice? Could government stand one hour with such a penalty? And is this the character of the government of God? Did the blessed Savior, who came to redeem us from the curse of the law, come to this world to announce that crime and its punishment is one and the same thing? and that to save men from the curse of the law is impossible?

But how plainly does the Savior, in its connection, put down the Universalist interpretation of this passage! He says, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." (*John* v. 24, 25.) No one can misunderstand this language. The Savior speaks of the spirit-

ually dead, and of a moral resurrection; they heard his voice; they passed from death to life; "the hour is coming, *and now is;*" "they shall not come into condemnation" when the evil come forth to damnation.

Beholding on the countenances of his auditors marks of surprise at this doctrine, he adds, "Marvel not at *this!*" that those who are dead in sin now hear my voice, and live. A greater thing than this is to take place. "The hour is COMING, in the which all that are in their *graves* (making a distinction between those *morally* and those *literally* dead) shall hear my voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Now, in these words, if the Savior is speaking of men dead in sin, and representing them as buried, he would, to have preserved sense, have represented the good as being already alive. But both classes, the good and the evil, are dead; both are in their graves; both hear the voice of the Son of God; both come forth from their graves, the one to a resurrection of *life*, the other to a resurrection of *damnation*.

Nor is it true that all men have at some time done both good and evil; and hence, as Universalists maintain, must share in both resurrections. In the sense of the Scripture under consideration, all have not done good. The standard of goodness among men, is not the standard of the God of holiness. A man may be good in the estimation of his fellow-men, and yet be destitute of that goodness which he must have that he may stand accepted before God.

When the Almighty "looked down from heaven upon the children of men," he said, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." (*Ps.* xiv. 3.) But it is by no means asserted that at that time there were no moral or amiable men upon the earth; or that no man was good in the opinion of his fellow-men. But no one did good, because "none did understand and seek God." (v. 2.) On the other hand, it is said of Barnabas, "He was a good man;" which is explained by the words "full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." (*Acts* xi. 24.)

That faith in Jesus Christ is the principal feature of that goodness which secures to its possessor the resurrection of life, we learn from the Savior—"He that heareth my word, *and believeth on him that sent me, shall not come into condemnation.*" What is promised in the twenty-fourth verse to the believer, in the twenty-ninth is promised to all that do good. Not only is the believer to escape condemnation, but he is to come forth at last to the resurrection of life. To do good, in the sense of the passage under consideration, is to believe in God. To do evil, is to remain in unbelief. "He will reprove the world of *sin, because they believe not on me.*" (*John* xvi. 8, 9.) All who live and die in unbelief, live and die in sin. In the resurrection their doom will be "damnation."

Not only in the text and connection is the distinction plainly drawn between those spiritually and those literally dead; between those who at the time heard his voice, and all the dead in their graves who in the resurrection should hear; not only has the Savior stated the crime to be punished, as well as the

nature and the time of the punishment; but his instruction in this place corresponds with the general tenor of the Bible upon this subject.

In no part of the New Testament is the resurrection of the dead mentioned, in which is not found the same distinction in character and condition, expressed or implied, that is found in John v. 28, 29. In all places are there set forth two resurrections, and also two kinds of character, each of which is formed and chosen here.

"But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." That the people who heard this, understood him to refer to the future state of existence, is evident from this remark—"And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God." (*Luke* xiv. 15: compare *Matt.* xxvi. 29.)

"So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the *wicked* from among the just." (*Matt.* xiii. 49.)

When defending himself before the Roman tribunal, in the presence of Felix, Paul announces his belief in the resurrection of all the dead, "both of the just and unjust." And when he applied this subject to the conscience of the guilty governor, and "reasoned of judgment to come, Felix trembled." (*Acts* xxiv. 15, 25.)

In the fifteenth chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul speaks of those "who have fallen asleep

in Christ," who shall be "Christ's at his coming;" plainly teaching that some were not Christ's; and, at his final coming, would not be numbered among those whom "God will bring with him." (1 *Cor.* xv. 18, 23.)

To the Thessalonians Paul writes, "Them also which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him: —the *dead in Christ* shall rise first." (1 *Thess.* iv. 13, 18.) The resurrection of life precedes the resurrection of damnation.

The Revelation of St. John says, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." (*Rev.* xx. 6.) This teaches that all others are neither blessed nor holy, but on them the second death hath full power. What the second death is we learn from these words:—"And all liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." (*Rev.* xxi. 8.)

In presenting the natural order in which the doctrines of Christ stand, Paul speaks of "the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment;" showing that the raising of the dead precedes the eternal judgment. (*Heb.* vi. 2.)

We have, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, a catalogue of those who, by faith, pleased God. They are spoken of as having endured cruel mockings and scourgings, bonds and imprisonment, and every other suffering, and all that "they might obtain a *better* resurrection." (*Heb.* xi. 35, 36.)

Thus the reference of the resurrection of damna-

tion, spoken of by the Savior, to the future life, is established beyond the power of cavil to remove. It is confirmed by the united testimony of all the inspired writers who have alluded to the subject; and it presents an unanswerable argument against Universalism.

"Lord, are there few that be saved?" (*Luke* xiii. 23.) This inquiry of the disciples, taken with the reply of the Savior, was the occasion of much perplexity to my mind. Up to this time it is certain Jesus had not informed his disciples that all men are to be saved; for it would be an impeachment of their common sense to suppose that the disciples would have asked the Savior if *few* were to be saved, had he already taught them that all men shall be saved. The apostles were Jews; they held the faith of their nation in respect to the destruction of the wicked, and they must retain it until Christ should remove it. The direct question as to the number to be saved, afforded the Savior an excellent opportunity to settle the question forever, and, by a direct and unequivocal reply, to teach that all men are to be saved.

But his reply settles the point that all will *not* be saved. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will *seek* to enter in, and *shall not be able.*" (v. 24.)

These words reprove the curiosity of the apostles; they teach that none will be saved but those who enter in at the strait gate; that, to enter in, each must "*strive;*" to "*seek*" is not sufficient; that many who would merely seek to enter in will fail of salvation. And if those who only seek in this sense

are not saved, will those have a better fate who seek not at all?

RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

"There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and was buried: and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried, and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue: for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you, cannot; neither can they pass to us, that *would come* from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

n died, by losing his spiritual advantages, the beg-
, by obtaining them, of course came to life. In
room of placing the rich man in hell, and sending
arus into Abraham's bosom, the Savior, on the
und of Universalism, would have placed the beggar
the rich man's house, adding to his splendor and
iptuous fare, and then placed the rich man at the
e, to beg a few crumbs from Lazarus's table. Such
actually the change which took place, if the death
he rich man was the loss of his spiritual privileges,
the death of the beggar was the conversion of the
ntiles to the faith of Abraham. But Jesus says,
'he beggar died, and was carried by the angels into
aham's bosom; the rich man also died, and was
ied; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in
nents." (v. 22, 23.)

. The rich man says, "Father Abraham, have
rcy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the
of his finger in water, and cool my tongue." (v.
) This, as Universalists teach, signifies the great
ire, on the part of the Jews, to be blessed with the
pel by means of the Gentiles. But in what age
re they ever expressed such a desire? They have
ver acknowledged, up to this hour, that the Gentiles
ve the faith of Abraham. They have never solicited
truction from them, nor desired the consolation
hich the Gentiles enjoy. Hence, if the interpreta-
n which Universalists give is correct, then, in the
ssage, the Savior has not spoken according to truth;
r all history teaches that the Jews have never al-
wed that the Gentiles have the true faith, or ever
ught light or relief from them.

3. "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." (v. 26.)

The explanation makes these words teach that, by a divine purpose, or fixed decree, the conversion of a Jew is impossible. How much soever he may desire to be a Christian, or a Christian may desire to convey the gospel to the sons of Abraham, it cannot be done. But the fact is obvious and incontestable, that a Jew can be converted to Christ. And not only have numerous Jews been blessed with the gospel, but some have apostatized to Judaism from Christianity. So that, either the interpretation of Universalists, or the teaching of the Savior, is not true.

4. "I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." (v. 27, 28.)

But have the Jews ever made such a request? Do they desire Christians to seek out their brethren, and testify in relation to the gospel? Would they receive such a message gladly? Does not all history teach that the opposite is true?

5. Universalists can give no consistent account of the "five brethren" for whom the rich man had so much solicitude. If the rich man was a type of his nation, his request was an absurd one. "I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him (Lazarus) to my father's house." If the rich man represented the Jewish nation, then Abraham was his

father; and in what place soever Abraham was, there was properly his father's house. And the reason assigned for not complying, is ludicrously untrue — "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed." How could the gulf keep Lazarus from the house of the rich man's father, if Abraham were his father, and Lazarus were at that moment in his bosom?

And how could the rich man have brethren any where, if he stands as a type of his nation? How could five brethren be exposed to that place of torment, from which they could be saved only by timely repentance, if the whole nation, in the person of the rich man, were at that moment all of them "in hell, lifting up their eyes, being in torments"?

But, if five of the six brethren were out of hell, then the rich man does not typify the house of Israel; for all know that not a sixth part, but almost the whole nation, have been cut off for unbelief.

But, in the history, the rich man recognizes Abraham to be the father of his nation at large, and also speaks of his own particular father's house, and his five brethren there. This proves that he spake as an individual, and not as a representative of his nation. "Father Abraham, have mercy on me. I pray thee, father, that thou wouldest send him to *my* father's house." (v. 24, 27.) And how could Lazarus represent the Gentiles, seeing he was a *Jew*, and was as much the son of Abraham as the rich man?

6. "And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." (v. 26.)

Universalists tell us that we are "by this to understand that purpose of God, in which it is determined that the Jews shall not believe the gospel until the fulness of the Gentiles come in."

But in what part of the Bible is this divine purpose recorded? If this be so, why did God send Jesus to this people? Why did the Savior warn them, teach them, call them to repentance, and attempt to save them, if they were excluded from faith by the decree of God? Why did he send forth his disciples to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel"? And, after his death, why did he command them to begin at Jerusalem? Why does Paul say, "But seeing ye put it (the word of God) from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles"? (*Acts* xiii. 26.) Were these offers made in good faith to the Jews? Then was it in their power to believe the gospel.

The explanation given of the *gulf*, by Universalists, proves that a Jew cannot believe the gospel until the fulness of the Gentiles come in. "A great gulf *fixed*, so that they which would pass from hence to you *cannot*." If this unbelief is fixed by the purpose of God, then the conversion of a Jew is impossible. But such is not the fact. All the apostles were Jews; so were the seventy disciples; the five hundred brethren that saw the Lord at once, were Jews; and the converted thousands at Pentecost were of the same nation; and yet the fulness of the Gentiles had not come in. In every age since the ascension of Jesus, many of the sons of Abraham have believed on Christ; and still the fulness of the Gentiles tarries.

If, then, the gulf is unbelief, it can be passed, and Christ is made a deceiver. But if it be so "fixed" that it cannot be traversed,—if there is no passing from the world of woe to the world of joy,—then are the opinions of Universalists false, absurd, and destructive.

Having proved that the attempt to explain away this passage has failed, I wish to call your attention to the instruction conveyed in this history.

First. The teaching of the Savior would not have been complete, without the instruction contained in this history. As he was a teacher sent from God, all would expect from him plain instruction in regard to the future life. If beyond the grave there is a world of bliss, he would speak of it in plain terms. If there is a world of woe, he would lay it open, and warn men of their danger, and urge them "to flee from the wrath to come."

And this he has done. The gates of Paradise have been thrown open by his command. Its inhabitants, with their employment and their endless felicity, are so graphically set forth, that we can almost see the shining throng around the throne; we can almost hear the anthem shout that comes from beyond the tomb.

In the history under consideration, Christ has taught us, in terms that few impenitent men can read, and feel at ease, that there is a world of woe. He has lifted up the curtain that covers the dark world of death, and bade us know how fearful a thing it is to be lost. We are made to look in upon one who, in his lifetime, was rich, living in ease and

splendor, clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day. But after death he was so poor, that he could not purchase a drop of water to cool his tongue. In this account there is no argument, no pathetic appeal. It is uttered as if the speaker knew what he said, and had authority to say it. Open your statute-book. You find no argument in it; no reasons assigned why a murderer must be hung, or a felon be imprisoned for life. You find in it mandate and authority. You are forbidden to do certain acts, and if you do them, are threatened with imprisonment or death.

So in the history before us. The Savior has set forth the bliss of heaven and the woe of hell. He teaches us that the destiny of men is fixed at death; and that if men will not be warned and persuaded to escape the "place of torment" by the instrumentality God is employing, none other will be provided, neither will it avail any thing though one arose from the dead.

Secondly. The scripture we have been considering is not a parable. Not one of the many parables spoken by the Redeemer, from the first to the last, leaves any person in doubt as to its character or its design. At a glance, the most unlettered man takes in the instruction of the parables. Most of them begin thus, "And he spake a parable," or thus, "the kingdom of heaven is *likened* to a certain man," &c. And those that convey very important doctrine are expounded. The parables of the sower, and of the wheat and tares, are very carefully explained. (*Matt.* xiii. 18—23, and 36—43.)

But in what part of the history of the rich man does the Savior intimate that he is speaking a parable? To what has he applied it? If it is a parable, what do the Scriptures say it teaches? If it was necessary to explain the parable of the tares, was it not as important to explain the "rich man"? Who was the rich man who died, and in hell lifted up his eyes in torment? In what condition in this world have men ever been placed, in which they have sought relief, and have been told that there was no mitigation, no relief, no escape from such dreadful torments? Would the Savior so minutely illustrate other parables, and leave this unexplained? If, as Dr. Whitby affirms, an allegory similar to this history was in existence in the time of the Savior, it cannot alter the case. Christ, by adopting it, sanctions the doctrine taught in it, and presents the narrative before us, as a clear representation of the world of woe. In this whole recital is there one word which intimates that it was an allegory? or a word to justify the interpretation of Universalists? Do the apostles explain it as they do? Does inspiration in any place come to their aid?

But am I told that there is imagery here, and that all of it cannot be literal? But in what case does the embellishment destroy the thing embellished? in what case does the imagery take from the truth of the subject illustrated?

Do Universalists allow this objection to have any force in other matters? Do they believe that heaven has literal walls, whose gates are salvation and praise? Do they believe that heaven has streets, which are

paved with gold or precious stones? But has heaven no existence? Is there no world of blessedness beyond the grave, because around the representation such drapery is hung? Yet if their reasoning is sound in respect to the history of the rich man, it is equally so in regard to heaven. And if there is no world of woe, then there is no realm of endless bliss. Both are destroyed by the same objections.

Nor does it avail any thing to offer a criticism upon the word here rendered *hell*, and say that its primitive meaning was the *grave*. For in reply it can be shown that the word rendered *heaven* originally signified simply the atmosphere that belts the globe. It is a sufficient answer in either case to say, that such was not the meaning attached to the words *heaven* and *hell*, when the Savior was upon the earth. It was only by departing from the *primitive* meaning, that the word *heaven* was used to signify a state of bliss beyond the grave. And if, in the text, the word *hell* cannot signify a place of torment in the immortal state, because its primary meaning was the *grave*, then heaven cannot mean a place of endless felicity, because the word originally signified the *atmosphere*. Thus Universalism destroys itself. In its anxiety to put out the fires of hell, it exterminates the glory of heaven itself.

Nor does it amount to any thing to allege that *hadēs*, the place of punishment to the rich man, is to be destroyed. But how? Inspiration replies, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the

lake of fire." (*Rev.* xx. 14, 15.) But does this promise relief to the rich man? Is the lake of fire a place of happiness? Is the second death immortal felicity?

So much is certain, even upon Universalist ground. *Hades* is a place of exquisite torment; and as no man can enter *hades* till he is dead, the punishment of the rich man must have taken place after death. It was a punishment awful in its nature, one that admitted of no cessation or mitigation. For if there had been any prospect of deliverance, Abraham would have reminded the rich man of the salutary nature and limited duration of his present pains; and encouraged him to fortitude, for that relief would come, and deliverance not be long delayed. But he affords no hope; "the gulf is *fixed*, it *cannot* be passed!"

It is a fact that all Universalists, who are competent to judge, allow that the Jews, in the time of the Savior, were firm believers in the doctrine of endless misery. Their faith in the existence of God was not more universal. Mr. Balfour says, "Now, I admit that to this heathen notion [that *hades* was a place of punishment after death] our Lord might allude in the parable before us. The Jews had, in our Lord's day, imbibed many heathen notions, and this one among the rest." (*First Inq.* p. 58.)

Another writer says, "The Jews in the time of the Savior believed in endless punishment; they believed that *hades* was the place of punishment. Jesus, in the parable of the rich man, uses the figures that the Jews employ to express endless woe. Christ added to their opinion only in the anguish of the

rich man. The Jews thought that *hades* was a place of endless silence, darkness, and gloom. Jesus taught it was a place of exquisite anguish." That Christ added to the opinions of the Jews in respect to the anguish of the rich man, is true. But he also added to their information in another and an important sense. They thought that no Jew could be exposed to endless woe. But Jesus removed this idea by taking one of their own number, whom Abraham acknowledges to be a son, and placing him in the anguish of the realm of despair.

It matters not where or how the Jews obtained their faith in endless misery. They may have derived it from God or man; from Moses or the heathen. We have only to do with the fact that such faith upon this subject existed.

When the Savior began his ministry, he found this doctrine prevailing upon the earth. It was the faith of his nation. If it was an error, he knew it to be such, and saw at a glance all the evils that attended it. How, then, as an honest teacher of Universalism, would he have conducted? What success could he expect in preaching the salvation of all men to a people who believed in endless death, till this opinion should be removed?

Suppose a philanthropist finds in the way of his efforts to do good, a gigantic evil; an evil that meets him on every side, and prevents his success. Would he countenance and uphold it? Or would he give it a vigorous opposition, and on every occasion seek to destroy or remove it? Suppose a missionary meets, in his field of labor, with a wide-spread, all-opposing

error, which stands between him and success, and makes him toil for nought. Would he not feel that nothing could be done till he had conquered the error?

How do Universalists now conduct? By all who know any thing of their style of preaching, it will be remembered that the great burden of their sermons is to disprove endless misery. Nine tenths of all the Universalist sermons that I ever heard, had this end in view. And the reason assigned is, that endless misery is the popular faith, and, as such, it stands directly in the way of Universalism. A man will not receive the idea that all men will be saved while he believes that many will perish forever.

The same state of things encountered the Savior in his teaching. Endless misery was the popular faith. How, then, did the Savior meet it? In no instance did he reprove the Jews for holding this doctrine. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," is the only phrase in the Bible in which Universalists pretend to find a censure upon the general belief. But remember that the doctrine was not *peculiar* to the Pharisees; and that they believed in the existence of God as much as in eternal death. The declaration as much commands the disciples to be atheists, as it does to deny the doctrine of endless misery.

But not only is it an incontestable fact, that the Savior did not oppose this doctrine; that on no occasion did he call in question the eternity of punishment; but when he spoke of punishment, he used the language, the figures, the expressions, commonly employed by those who believed in it. He made no explanation,

qualified them not, gave no intimation that he employed them in any other than the popular sense; nor did the Jews ever accuse him of denying their views of future punishment. He differed from them, as Universalists allow, in making the punishment in hell more severe, and including in it the sons of Abraham, as well as the Gentiles.

That the Savior admitted the popular idea, the advocates of Universalism have been unable to deny. Mr. Balfour says, "Is there any thing, then, surprising, that, in this parable, [of the rich man,] our Lord should introduce the popular idea which the Jews had imbibed about *hades?*" (*First Inq.* p. 56.)

Mr. Whittemore says, "Let it be distinctly understood, that it is our opinion Jesus introduced those views of *hades* [that it was the place of endless punishment] which the Jews had received from the heathen, and used them in a parabolic sense, to illustrate his instructions." (*Notes on Par.* p. 159.)

So much, then, all allow,—that the people of whom Christ was, and to whom he came, believed in endless punishment. The Savior admitted their opinions, used their language, and added to the intensity of the woes of hell. He believed in endless misery, or he did not. If he *did*, then Universalism is a fatal error. If he did not, then our Lord was not honest; he was a deceiver of the people; for he acquiesced in a fatal doctrine, and confirmed the Jews in their opinions. Universalism blasphemously impeaches the integrity of the divine Redeemer!

And the reasons Universalists present, why the

Savior admitted the doctrine in question, do but add to the difficulty, and make the conduct of the Savior still more inexplicable. Universalists tell us that this doctrine was borrowed from the heathen; that neither Moses nor the prophets taught it.

Had the doctrine of endless punishment, so generally received by the Jews, originated in the misunderstanding of some portion of the Bible, it must seem strange that Jesus, the Teacher of truth and righteousness, did not correct a mistake so ruinous; more strange that he should countenance it in any form. But that such a notion, borrowed from the heathen, and one that Universalists affirm to be dishonorable to God and injurious to man,—that *such* an idea, coming from *such* a source, should be adopted, confirmed, and still further extended, by Jesus, cannot be allowed, if the truth was in him.

In comparison with the Savior, how much more frank and open, upon this same subject, do Universalists appear! They find the same doctrine in the faith of the church that our Lord found among the divinely-instructed people of God. Do they adopt its terms, or use its expressions, to teach Universalism? Did any man, when hearing a sermon upon Universalism, suppose he was listening to a defence of endless misery? Take up a Universalist book; do you think you are reading an argument in favor of eternal death? How is it, then, that these men are so much more manly and open than was the Savior, if he was a Universalist?

Suppose a preacher of Universalism were to go into an Orthodox pulpit for the express purpose of defend-

ing Universalism. He announces his text, — "Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But fear him which, *after* he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell." He explains it as the Orthodox do, uses the same figures and language in illustration, and in no way intimates that he departs from the common opinion in respect to the passage. What impression would the preacher leave? This, most surely, — either that he was not a Universalist, or that he was a hypocrite and a deceiver.

Under such circumstances the Savior taught. Universalists say, that his errand to this world was, to teach that all men would be saved. He stood in the synagogues of a nation which believed in eternal death. He there speaks of future punishment in the customary language of his nation, and in no case intimates a departure from their opinion. If Universalism is true, can it be that the Savior was honest? Does it not exhibit him as a deceiver? Must not every mind which feels the least respect for the character of Jesus of Nazareth, regard the consequences of such reasoning with the utmost horror?

Neither is it true, as Universalists assert, that the history contains no proof that the rich man was a wicked person. He was sent to hell, not because he was rich, but because he was wicked. He desired that Lazarus might be sent to his five brethren to "testify unto them." And he was sure that "if one went from the dead, they would repent." (v. 30.) If not wicked, why did they need repentance? and if timely repentance could keep his brethren from that place of torment, it would have kept him from it.

It was because he was a wicked man, and in his lifetime did not repent, that he perished. (See also *Ezek.* xviii. 27.)

I conclude my notice of this portion of the divine threatenings with the remarks, that Universalists are not able to remove the objections which the history of the rich man and Lazarus presents to their system; that their interpretation of this history is inconsistent, absurd, and untrue; that, upon their own admission, our Lord, in this passage, inculcated the popular doctrine of endless misery; and that this proves that he believed it, and was not a teacher of the salvation of all men, or that he was what his enemies pronounced him to be, a deceiver. No labor, sophistry, or ingenuity, can turn this passage from its application to the future world, nor remove, nor weaken, the solemn warning it contains, to all who live in sin, to repent in their "lifetime," "lest they also go to that place of torment."

PARABLE OF THE TARES OF THE FIELD.

"Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto

him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay: lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn." (*Matt.* xiii. 24—30.)

I can well recollect the impression made upon my mind, when I was a Universalist, by the remark of a gentleman, that my explanation of this parable differed very materially from the explanation given by Jesus Christ to his own words. I felt the force of the rebuke. No man can read the explanation of this parable given by Universalists, and place by its side the explanation given of it by the Savior at the particular request of the disciples, and not be amazed at the audacity and recklessness of the men who would substitute an exposition so different from our Lord's. To make the facts apparent, I will present the two interpretations side by side.

We are told that the disciples came to Jesus, saying, "Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field." (*Matt.* xiii. 36.)

Christ's Explanation.	*Universalist Explanation.*
"He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man.	"By the Son of man, Jesus means himself.
"The field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one.	"The field signifies the material universe; the children of the kingdom were those to whom the kingdom was preached, or those who had actually embraced the gospel; the tares simply signify wicked persons.

"The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels.

"As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world.

"The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father." (*Matt* xiii. 36—43.)

"The devil is that perverse and wicked spirit, so opposite to the spirit of Christ, which led men to say, 'Lord, Lord!' while they performed not the will of God. [Thus the tares sown, and the devil who sowed them, are the same thing.]

"The harvest took place at the end of the Mosaic age. The angels mean the Roman armies, which God sent to destroy his rebellious people, the Jews.

"The furnace was the city of Jerusalem; and the righteous, which are to shine as the sun, are those Christians, who, after the Jews were destroyed, would experience *comparative* earthly felicity, and have an enlarged enjoyment, in this life, of gospel peace."

(*Notes on Par.* p. 52.)

Such, then, is the explanation of the explanation of Christ, which Universalists give; and are these men to be trusted, when they thus impiously presume to correct the Son of God, and in so doing say that he was not able to express his own meaning? Does he say any thing in his explanation about "evil principles," "Roman armies," or "the destruction of Jerusalem"? If he meant to teach such things, his explanation of his parable needs more explaining than the parable itself. But if the Savior clearly expressed his own meaning, then Universalists bring upon themselves the deep guilt of "handling the word of

less, then, can the simple phrase "resur-
: dead," prove any thing as to a future
ıtence, especially when limited by the
world," or age.
eference proved by the words "they are
ıe angels"? But we are told that the
ıies are the angels." It would not be
go out of this world to become equal to

ıce to future life proved by the assertion
resurrection-state, men will "neither
given in marriage"? But such a con-
ings is attainable even in this world.
priests have always exhibited this fea-
esurrection-state; and it is well known
community of Shakers, they neither
re they given in marriage.
alists will be consistent, they will have
in the same state of existence where
ıeir hell. Let a man believe in Univer-
in their opinion, he will have already
ıat world, and the resurrection of the
him do as did the Roman armies, and he
to the angels. Then let him attach
fr y of Shakers, and he will have
t whose children neither marry
age.
insult the good sense of my
necessary to dwell longer on a
g has been declared by its
d himself.

God deceitfully," and "wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction."

The principles of interpretation which Universalists bring to this parable, if applied to future life and blessedness, would disprove them also; and the Bible could not teach future life at all. As an example, turn to Luke xx. 35—"But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Universalists, without any hesitation, apply this text to the immortal state, and cite it as a proof of some of their notions. Yet it has no mark of reference to the future life that the parable of the tares has not. If the principles of interpretation which they bring to that parable are sound, I challenge Universalists to prove that this text has any reference whatever to future life.

Does the phrase "worthy to obtain *that world*," prove it? But it is said that the word "world" means nothing but "age," and the phrase "this world and the world to come," means only "the Jewish and Christian age." Nothing more, then, can be meant than this—"they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that age;" that is, the Christian age.

Does the phrase "resurrection from the dead," prove a reference to the life to come? By no means. On John v. 28, 29, Universalists argue that coming forth *out of the graves* to a resurrection of life, or of damnation, does not even prove that the persons were

dead; much less, then, can the simple phrase "resurrection of the dead," prove any thing as to a future state of existence, especially when limited by the phrase "that world," or age.

Is such a reference proved by the words "they are equal unto the angels"? But we are told that the "Roman armies are the angels." It would not be necessary to go out of this world to become equal to such angels!

Is a reference to future life proved by the assertion that, in the resurrection-state, men will "neither marry nor be given in marriage"? But such a condition of things is attainable even in this world. The Romish priests have always exhibited this feature of the resurrection-state; and it is well known that in the community of Shakers, they neither marry nor are they given in marriage.

If Universalists will be consistent, they will have their heaven in the same state of existence where they place their hell. Let a man believe in Universalism, and, in their opinion, he will have already obtained "that world, and the resurrection of the dead." Let him do as did the Roman armies, and he will be equal to the angels. Then let him attach himself to the fraternity of Shakers, and he will have obtained that world whose children neither marry nor are given in marriage.

I feel that I should insult the good sense of my readers, did I deem it necessary to dwell longer on a parable whose meaning has been declared by its author, the Son of God himself.

JUDGMENT OF THE LAST DAY.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? when saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited

me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (*Matt.* xxv. 31—46.)

The passage here presented is called, by Universalists, "the parable of the sheep and goats." By what authority they call it a parable, they do not inform their followers. The Savior gives no such intimation; and if Universalists have such knowledge, they "are wise above what is written." But, if these verses contain parabolic instruction, that instruction is not a parable of sheep and goats; the Savior spoke no such parable. The instruction begins, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate *them* one from another, *as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.*" Separate whom? Sheep and goats? Certainly not. But before him *all nations* are to be gathered; and *he*, the Son of man, will separate *them*, the nations, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. Here, in this plain description, he refers incidentally, by way of illustration, to the custom of the shepherd, and then resumes the narrative, without alluding again to the shepherd or his flock.

In Matt. xxiv. 27, Jesus says, "For as the lightning

cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Suppose some one should attempt an explanation of this chapter, and style it "an examination of the parable of thunder and lightning." Who would not be astonished at his stupidity? But could it not be done with as much propriety as there is in calling the latter part of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew "the parable of the sheep and goats"? I ask again, By what authority is this passage called a parable? If this be not literal instruction, there is none in the Bible. If this is a parable, the fifteenth chapter of the First of Corinthians is a parable, and so is every other part of the Bible.

Universalists find this a difficult passage. They must first make it a parable, and then find what they please to call its meaning. This granted to them, they can remove the difficulty which this passage puts in their way.

If it had never been clearly shown that it is not a parable, but is a fearful representation of "the judgment of the great day," it can be clearly proved that the passage has no reference to the event which Universalists say it was intended to teach. All know, I presume, that Universalists refer the fulfilment of this prediction to the destruction of Jerusalem. I am prepared to show that it has no reference to that event; that, at the destruction of Jerusalem, no such events took place as are described in the verses; and that the whole refers to the future life.

The interpretation which Universalists give of this passage is the following:—

error, which stands between him and success, and makes him toil for nought. Would he not feel that nothing could be done till he had conquered the error?

How do Universalists now conduct? By all who know any thing of their style of preaching, it will be remembered that the great burden of their sermons is to disprove endless misery. Nine tenths of all the Universalist sermons that I ever heard, had this end in view. And the reason assigned is, that endless misery is the popular faith, and, as such, it stands directly in the way of Universalism. A man will not receive the idea that all men will be saved while he believes that many will perish forever.

The same state of things encountered the Savior in his teaching. Endless misery was the popular faith. How, then, did the Savior meet it? In no instance did he reprove the Jews for holding this doctrine. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," is the only phrase in the Bible in which Universalists pretend to find a censure upon the general belief. But remember that the doctrine was not *peculiar* to the Pharisees; and that they believed in the existence of God as much as in eternal death. The declaration as much commands the disciples to be atheists, as it does to deny the doctrine of endless misery.

But not only is it an incontestable fact, that the Savior did not oppose this doctrine; that on no occasion did he call in question the eternity of punishment; but when he spoke of punishment, he used the language, the figures, the expressions, commonly employed by *those who believed* in it. He made no explanation,

splendor, clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day. But after death he was so poor, that he could not purchase a drop of water to cool his tongue. In this account there is no argument, no pathetic appeal. It is uttered as if the speaker knew what he said, and had authority to say it. Open your statute-book. You find no argument in it; no reasons assigned why a murderer must be hung, or a felon be imprisoned for life. You find in it mandate and authority. You are forbidden to do certain acts, and if you do them, are threatened with imprisonment or death.

So in the history before us. The Savior has set forth the bliss of heaven and the woe of hell. He teaches us that the destiny of men is fixed at death; and that if men will not be warned and persuaded to escape the "place of torment" by the instrumentality God is employing, none other will be provided, neither will it avail any thing though one arose from the dead.

Secondly. The scripture we have been considering is not a parable. Not one of the many parables spoken by the Redeemer, from the first to the last, leaves any person in doubt as to its character or its design. At a glance, the most unlettered man takes in the instruction of the parables. Most of them begin thus, "And he spake a parable," or thus, "the kingdom of heaven is *likened* to a certain man," &c. And those that convey very important doctrine are expounded. The parables of the sower, and of the wheat and tares, are very carefully explained. (*Matt.* xiii. 18—23, and 36—43.)

But in what part of the history of the rich man does the Savior intimate that he is speaking a parable? To what has he applied it? If it is a parable, what do the Scriptures say it teaches? If it was necessary to explain the parable of the tares, was it not as important to explain the "rich man"? Who was the rich man who died, and in hell lifted up his eyes in torment? In what condition in this world have men ever been placed, in which they have sought relief, and have been told that there was no mitigation, no relief, no escape from such dreadful torments? Would the Savior so minutely illustrate other parables, and leave this unexplained? If, as Dr. Whitby affirms, an allegory similar to this history was in existence in the time of the Savior, it cannot alter the case. Christ, by adopting it, sanctions the doctrine taught in it, and presents the narrative before us, as a clear representation of the world of woe. In this whole recital is there one word which intimates that it was an allegory? or a word to justify the interpretation of Universalists? Do the apostles explain it as they do? Does inspiration in any place come to their aid?

But am I told that there is imagery here, and that all of it cannot be literal? But in what case does the embellishment destroy the thing embellished? in what case does the imagery take from the truth of the subject illustrated?

Do Universalists allow this objection to have any force in other matters? Do they believe that heaven has literal walls, whose gates are salvation and praise? Do they believe that heaven has streets, which are

But we know that in the fierce and bloody civil wars which preceded the overthrow of the Jews, thousands of that nation were slain in battle, thousands more died by the hand of authority, and many more were swept away by the united power of famine and pestilence. All these escaped the doom which was threatened in the destruction of Jerusalem. But Jesus told the guilty that they could not escape the damnation of hell; that they should all be punished in the day of judgment. He could not have referred to the ruin of Jerusalem; for most of those to whom he spoke did not live to that time; and some, perhaps, survived it, and went into captivity.

2. The Savior, in all his instructions to his disciples, inculcated watchfulness and fidelity. In the parable of the talents, (*Matt.* xxv. 14—30,) he exhibits the respective rewards of fidelity and disobedience, when he should call them to their account. The recreant disciple is often threatened with perdition. Men are warned against shrinking from duty, even though the body should be killed; for it is better to allow men to destroy the body, than to expose the soul to hell. Christ assures those who may deny him before men, that he will deny them before his Father and the holy angels.

All this, and much more of the same import, as Universalists tell us, has reference to the fate of Jerusalem. At its destruction, the apostles, if faithful up to that hour, were to be rewarded with life eternal; if unfaithful, punished with everlasting *misery*. But is it true that Jesus thus promised *and threatened* in relation to this event? Then did

he threaten them with that to which they never were exposed, and to which he knew they would not be exposed, even if they should become apostates. They were all dead, save one, before Jerusalem was destroyed; and the Savior knew it would be so when he thus urged them to faithfulness. Now, what mockery, what trifling, to urge men to duty from fear of a temporal calamity which was not to occur until the men addressed *should be in their graves!* But no one can deny that the Savior threatened the disciples, if they abandoned his cause, with banishment from God, with a "denial before the face of his Father," with "the destruction of the soul in hell," with a portion in that "fire prepared for the devil and his angels," with an abode among those who dwell "where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth," and with "everlasting punishment." These threatenings could not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, because the persons threatened could not be involved in that calamity, as they died before it occurred. Had they even blasphemed against the Holy Ghost, they could never have been in *danger* of eternal damnation upon Universalist grounds; for they were beyond its reach before it came. These threatenings can only refer to that eternal world, in which all men will stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and receive according to the deeds done in the body. (2 *Cor.* v. 10.) They can only have their accomplishment in that world in which death triumphs, and the "wicked go away into everlasting punishment."

But if all the threatenings, of fearful import, such

as we have quoted, which denounce woe upon "the ungodly," and threaten the impenitent with "wrath to come," with "hell-fire," with "the damnation of hell," refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, then all who died *before* that event escaped the punishment, and avoided the impending and merited calamity. Thus ungodly men, and all apostates, received a much better portion than did the apostles and the faithful Christians. For the apostles suffered bitter and cruel persecution all their lives, and died, most of them, an ignominious and dreadful death; while the enemies of Christ escaped previous persecution, died before Jerusalem was destroyed, and escaped that too; and thus evaded punishment in both "worlds" or "ages." Thus the threatenings of Christ are made a mockery, and his warnings a deceit.

But shall I be told that those enemies who died before Jerusalem was destroyed, did not escape punishment, being punished in the deed? To this I reply, if Christ threatened the ungodly with the damnation of hell, which damnation was punishment in the ruin of Jerusalem, then all who died before that ruin came, escaped the threatened doom. But, on the other hand, if men are punished as they pass along, it is not true, as asserted in the Bible, that God "*reserves* the wicked unto a day of judgment to be *punished!*" If those who died before Jerusalem was destroyed, were punished *as much* as they deserve, then all who suffered what they did, and were, besides, involved in that destruction, were punished *more* than they deserve; and the judgment

is not what the judgment of God is said to be, "righteous and just," but partial and unequal.

But suppose all the wicked Jews had lived to perish in the siege of their capital, — in what would their condition have differed from many other nations, which have been invaded, conquered, and carried away into captivity? What did those in that siege suffer more than their brethren did in those bloody civil wars that preceded their political overthrow? How was that to be so peculiarly dreadful, beyond all other example, whereas other nations had been destroyed by fire and sword, as well as they?

In what sense would the *temporal* condition of the apostles, had they lived till that destruction, have been more desirable than the fate of the enemies of Christ, even of those who perished with Jerusalem? During all their life, they were poor and persecuted; often imprisoned and scourged; often destitute of food and raiment; and at last they died an ignominious death, because they "endured to the end." In what respect did death, at the siege of Jerusalem, appear worse than the death suffered by each of Christ's chosen and faithful disciples? In what way in this life could the enemies of Jesus have suffered more? The persons involved in the overthrow of Jerusalem could not have endured more than did the faithful apostles during their natural lives, nor have suffered a more violent and cruel death. Where, then, was the fulfilment of the promises of *rest, victory, salvation, a crown of life;* of the taking away of all things that offend; of the saving of the life; of freedom *from toil, care, woe,* and pain; of perfect deliver-

ance from their enemies, and from death itself? They found it not in this life; they expected it not. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." "There is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me in that day." (*Phil.* iii. 11. 2 *Tim.* iv. 8.) If in this life only their reward was to be found, they were not only "of all men most miserable," but of all men most deceived!

The Bible teaches us that, at the judgment which all must meet, the suffering is for the guilty, and for those only. But in the destruction of Jerusalem, the innocent suffered more than the guilty. In that dreadful siege, women, children, and babes, endured the most. Mothers cooked their own children; and as they ate, fathers snatched the horrid food from the unnatural parent, only to satisfy with it the relentless cravings of their own hunger. And yet those guilty men, whose crimes brought down this calamity, long before, had gone down to their graves; and, upon the Universalist's theory, were in glory, far from all trouble and pain, leaving others to reap the whirlwind which they had sowed. Such is tender mercy as it is understood by men who reject the doctrines of Jesus Christ.

3. Nor is it true that, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the condition of Christians was improved. It was, in fact, made more intolerable. They were delivered from the Jews, whose power to harm was limited; and were placed in the hands of enemies *whose* power was unlimited, and whose disposition to *persecute* the followers of Christ was equal to their

ability. Christ said that, at his coming, his followers should receive the greatest of blessings — "life eternal," "treasures in heaven," "resurrection of life," an end of persecution, a relief from all conflict and warfare, a perfect deliverance from all enemies, and from all who troubled them, and an admittance into the presence of God, and to "the glory prepared for them from the foundation of the world."

The destruction of Jerusalem brought no such blessings as these to the disciples. Their temporal condition was made worse. The Romans, to whom they were made subject, after Jerusalem was destroyed, took away their few privileges, and in all things proved themselves severer oppressors than the Jews ever were. They had power to do the Christians a deeper injury, and visit upon them a more dreadful persecution. And on every occasion, they made the Christians feel their power. This Universalists admit. In a labored article in the Expositor, (vol. ii. pp. 238, 239,) it is said, "The religious enemies of the disciples, who were Jews, being Roman subjects, had not the prerogative to take their lives. After the divine Instructor had presented his disciples with these two authorities, [Jews and Romans,] which would be employed against them, it was natural for him to warn them to be *more on their guard against falling into the hands of the Roman* authorities, than *into the hands of those whose power was less extensive.*" So, then, when Christ promised his followers endless blessedness and rest at his coming, encouraged them to bear up under their fearful persecutions, and prompted them to duty by hope of "great reward

in heaven," he simply meant that the Jews would be destroyed, and the disciples be delivered over to the Romans, who could more cruelly persecute them, and put them to death; *and against "falling into whose hands the disciples were warned, by the divine Instructor, to be on their guard!"*

That the destruction of Jerusalem broke the power of the Jews is true; that it relieved the faithful disciples from sufferings is not true. It only changed their oppressors, and delivered them over to a more cruel and savage foe, who could inflict upon them all the miseries that the Jews had power to inflict, and then add death in its most appalling form. No student of history can be ignorant of the fact, that, for *more than two hundred years after Jerusalem was destroyed*, the Roman power followed the Christians with unrelenting persecutions, to which history furnishes no parallel. In a temporal point of view, the destruction of the city of David was an injury to the disciples. It increased the temporal sufferings of Christians, and added to their woes. So far from affording them relief or salvation, it opened the flood-gates of dreadful anguish.

If, then, the blessings referred to were to be conferred at the downfall of Jerusalem, they never came; and the faithful in Christ were of all men most miserable.

I close my remarks upon this passage by saying that it refers to the eternal world, and will have its fulfilment in that day in which Christ shall come *to judgment*, and separate the righteous from the *wicked*. No event, such as is described in this scrip-

ture, has ever transpired upon earth. The destruction of Jerusalem did not introduce the righteous into life eternal, but into deeper misery. The text points to the next existence, and is yet to be fulfilled. It warns the impenitent of that hour in which the assembled universe shall stand before their Judge, and pass the final test. It describes the process, the sentence, the changeless destiny, of both the godly and the ungodly. The one will go away into endless life, the other into endless punishment.

Universalist teachers inform their followers that Christians reject their interpretations of Scripture, because they will not examine them. But the truth is, so far as they are credited, they are credited for this very reason. No rational man would risk his hopes of eternity upon such perversion of Scripture, such palpable and violent perversion of the word of God, if he would give the subject a few moments of calm and prayerful consideration.

The remarks I have offered upon the interpretation of Universalists, given to the words of Christ in Matthew xxv., will apply to all that portion of the divine teachings which they apply to the destruction of Jerusalem. To them I refer my hearers. (*Matt.* iii. 12; v. 22; xi. 22—24; xiii. 47—50; xvi. 25, 26; xxiii. 33. *Mark* x. 29, 30. 2 *Thess.* i. 7—10. *Heb.* x. 26—31.)

TEXTS THAT EXPRESS OR IMPLY CONDITIONS.

Many of the reasons against Universalism, drawn from the threatenings of the Bible, will be introduced into the discourse upon future judgment, and, on that account, will for the present be omitted.

That class of texts which expresses or implies conditions, I have ever regarded as among the most unanswerable arguments which can be brought against Universalism. When an advocate of that system, I was more perplexed with these portions of Scripture than almost any other. When texts were given me to explain, such as usually are adduced against Universalism, I could offer a plausible interpretation, which would frequently satisfy the inquirer, if not myself. But when a text, accompanied by a condition, was presented, I found an unanswerable difficulty in the simple query, "Suppose that any one does not comply with the condition; what then?"

1. The Savior, in his Sermon on the Mount, describes those who are blessed and accepted of God, and what their final reward will be. If men are not "poor in spirit," "meek," "merciful," "pure in heart," "peace-makers," do not "hunger and thirst after righteousness," they are cursed; they have no inheritance in heaven; they shall not obtain mercy; they shall not see God; they shall not be called the children of God; for them there will be no reward in heaven. (*Matt.* v. 1—12.) Many live and die without forming those characters which alone can render them blessed.

2. The Savior says, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." (*Matt.* vi. 15, 20.) Yet many waste this whole life without laying up treasure in heaven, *and live* and die in the most deadly hatred toward *their fellow*-men. Will these, in heaven, enjoy

treasure they have never laid up, and receive forgiveness, when they have disregarded the condition on which the promise of forgiveness rests, and by which alone it can be secured?

3. "*Come* unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; and ye shall find rest unto your souls." (*Matt.* xi. 28, 29.) Of many who heard him, Jesus said, "And ye *will not* come to me that ye might have life." (*John* v. 40.) Millions, in our day, refuse the offer of life, and "tread under foot the Son of God," and "die in their sins." Will these have life? Though they refuse to come to the Savior, will they have rest? Though they reject the yoke of Christ, will they be entitled to that rest which "remaineth for the people of God"?

4. To Nicodemus Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." (*John* iii. 3.) Call this change what you please, it is essential to salvation. Universalists will not pretend that all men are born again. How, then, upon their own acknowledgment, can all men see the kingdom of God?

5. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever *believeth* in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (*John* iii. 14, 15.) The occasion referred to, when Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, is recorded in Numbers xxi. 8, 9. The people were bitten by serpents, and the bite was fatal. God commanded Moses to make a brazen serpent, and erect it on a pole. Healing was conditioned upon

looking at the serpent. All who looked were healed. Those who refused to look, died. There was virtue enough in the serpent to heal the whole nation. If all were not healed, it was not for want of virtue in the remedy, but because some who were bitten would not look upon it. "*Even so* must the Son of man be lifted up," to heal the fearful malady of sin. And what looking upon the serpent did to the bodies of the Jews, *believing* on Christ does to the souls of sinners. "Whoso *believeth* in him shall not perish;" all others will. Those who believe will have eternal life; those who believe not will have eternal death. The condition must be complied with, if the blessing is to be secured; as much so under the gospel, as when Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness.

6. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (*John* iii. 36.) Christ came not to condemn the world, for the world was already condemned. He came not to proclaim the wrath of God, for it was already proclaimed; it rested on men, as the sentence of death abides upon the criminal before his execution. Christ came, because men were already condemned, and because the wrath of God was then resting upon them. His mission was to offer pardon to the guilty, and "to save them that believe." (1 *Cor.* i. 21.) But the condition of pardon and salvation is to believe on the Son. Those who, by faith, have the Son, have everlasting life; they are no longer under condemnation, *no longer* exposed to eternal death; they are pardoned; their sins are blotted out. (Acts iii. 19.) And

they obtain the evidence of their recovery from spiritual death, and of their inheritance in heaven.

But those who "believe not are condemned already." Upon those who reject the condition, the wrath of God settles down, to abide forever. They are left to that eternal condemnation, to save from which Christ came; but from which they cannot be saved, "because they believe not in the name of the only-begotten Son of God." (*John* iii. 16—18.)

7. "Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now, they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air. But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." (1 *Cor.* ix. 24—27.)

1. Upon this passage I remark that Paul here, as in other places, compares this life to a race, in which some lose, and some win. He declares that the great prize to be obtained is an incorruptible crown; and that, unless sought for, it will not be obtained. "So run that ye may obtain." (v. 24.) He in this language refers to the well-known games which were celebrated near Corinth. Those who entered their names as competitors were called upon to undergo great privations; to abstain from all stimulating meats and drinks, and every indulgence having a tendency to enervate the *body; to* endure a long and painful *course of preparation;* and then, with a number of

rivals, run for the prize, which could be won only by the greatest exertions, and, when obtained, was but a garland of forest leaves, that must soon fade away.

Christians were engaged in a race; and this life was the race-course. The prize was a crown of life, which would be awarded by the Judge only when the race was concluded. And while those who did not enter upon the race would not be crowned, neither would they that did, unless they "endured to the end."

2. He alludes also to the conditions upon which the prize was to be obtained, and applies them to the gaining of the crown of life proposed in the gospel. "Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things." (v. 25.) "And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully." (2 *Tim.* ii. 5.) A man must not only strive, but, in order to be crowned, he must strive lawfully. Though he strive, and touch the goal, yet if, in the race, he violates the rules or conditions of the games, he is not a victor; he is covered with disgrace. So a man who wishes an incorruptible crown must strive, and strive lawfully, or he will not gain it.

3. He shows the encouragement the gospel holds out to all. In those races all ran, but one only could obtain the prize. Though they strove lawfully and hard, devoted months to preparation, denied themselves food and rest, and endured all manner of privations,—still they ran uncertain of success: the *victory* might be given to another, for "the race is not *always to the* swift." But in the Christian race, all

who strove *lawfully*, and strove to the end, should be victors. And wisely does he reason that, if men, to secure an earthly crown, underwent so much, then such as have an immortal crown in view may well suffer and toil, strive lawfully, and strive ever, to gain the reward.

4. The awful consequence attending a neglect of duty, — not running at all, violating the rules of the race, or not complying with the condition upon which success depends, — is graphically set forth in the words, "Lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." (v. 27.)

Paul here refers to those officers or judges of the games, whose business it was to proclaim the conditions of the games, display the prizes, animate the competitors, proclaim the victors, and confer the crown. If, after he had preached, and warned, and pointed out the way of salvation, he should be unfaithful, or fail to keep under his body, or to run on to the end, his high office would procure him no favor. Not only would he not obtain a crown of life, but he would be a castaway.

If, then, so much preparation, toil, circumspection, lawful striving, diligence, and perseverance, is needful to obtain a wreath of laurel, will less suffice to obtain a crown of life? and can Universalism be true? Will all men at last obtain the crown, though not one of them ran? If these conditions are essential,—if, as the apostle argues, this life is a race which they must run *who would* win, — are there not millions of our *race, who not* only do not strive lawfully,

but do not strive at all? Can they be saved, if the apostle has written the truth as it in Jesus?

5. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a *far more* exceeding and eternal weight of glory." (2 *Cor.* iv. 17.) But how can this be, if the present life has no connection with the future? How can Paul, or any one, have a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, if all men are to be *equal* in the resurrection?

6. "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present" in the body, "or absent" from the body, "we may be accepted of him." (2 *Cor.* v. 9.) If there were no doubt of his acceptance, why *labor to secure* that which was already certain? Why preach, toil, and strive, in reference to this one event, if it were not doubtful, and there were no certain danger? But there was doubt, there was danger, that he should at last "be found naked." His whole life was devoted to one end,—to secure his acceptance with God; and he assigns the reason why he thus labored, in the words which follow: "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ." (v. 10.) Would this have been needful, if all men will stand accepted, whether they labor to please God or not? whether they attempt to do his will, or sin with a high hand and a blaspheming tongue?

7. To attempt to cite all the cases in which a blessing is promised to men upon conditions, would be to transcribe a large part of the New Testament. I am unacquainted with a promise in the Bible that *has not* annexed to it a condition expressed or evidently implied. Indeed, in almost all cases in which

divine power has been miraculously displayed, it has been in connection with human agency. God has annexed conditions to all things. He would not heal the Israelites without the brazen serpent. Naaman must go and wash in Jordan. The blind man must wash in the pool of Siloam. When sinners were pricked to the heart by the Holy Ghost, their first question was, "What must I *do* to be saved?" I shall close this argument by noticing one other passage.

"I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 *Tim.* iv. 6—8.) These words suggest the following considerations:—

1. Paul was about to die. His course was almost ended. He was condemned to the cross; and was in prison, waiting to hear the tread of the executioner who was to lead him forth to death. But he was ready at any moment to be offered up as a sacrifice. We have before us his dying words. They have all the sanction that attends the death-bed of an inspired man.

2. The chief thing that animated and supported him was the great blessing in store for him as soon as he was "offered." "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." "The Lord, the righteous Judge," was to give him that crown. It was to be given "at that day," the day of judgment.

3. He gives us the foundation of his hope in Christ. The reasons why he expected that the righteous Judge would thus reward him at that day, are stated. They are three in number—"I have fought a good fight;" "I have finished my course;" "I have kept the faith." He likens himself to a warrior, a winner in a race, and a steward to whom is committed an important trust.

A successful warrior must do more than enlist; he must fight manfully, and spare neither toil nor blood when the cause of his country demands the sacrifice. He who should desert the standard of his country in the hour of peril, would be doomed to eternal infamy. He only would deserve or receive a crown of victory, who should fight till he conquered, or lay his lifeless body upon the field of conflict.

He is not a successful runner who only enters the lists, though he come well prepared; nor would he secure the prize, if he should run on a little way, and then turn back. Better would it be for him had he never entered. But he who strives lawfully, runs on, in spite of all obstacles, to the end, and reaches the goal;—he it is that is crowned.

Neither is he a good steward who neglects his trust, or gives up the treasures when assailed. But he who keeps his trust, and says to his coming Lord, "I have kept the treasure," will hear the blissful sentence, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

As a warrior, Paul had well fought the good fight *of faith;* and in the battles of his Sovereign, he was *about to* end his warfare with his life. It had ever

been his chief labor that, in the Christian race, he "might finish his course with joy." (*Acts* xx. 24.) His desire was granted; he had run well, and run to the end. And his dying moments were consoled and cheered by the truth, that now his arduous race was run, and his reward was on high. As a steward, too, of the faith, and of the manifold grace of God, he had been "found faithful," and with his dying breath he could say, in the presence of the Searcher of all hearts, "I have kept the faith."

But suppose it had not been so. Suppose he had found the warfare arduous, and, in the time of conflict, had deserted the cross, and joined the enemies of his Savior. Suppose he had run a short distance in the race, and, finding it a severe and painful struggle, had turned back, as many had done before him, or returned to his former enmity. Or suppose that, knowing that the safe-keeping of the faith must be attended with great sacrifices, watchfulness, trials, and persecutions, he should have abandoned his trust, or, like Judas, betrayed it; what effect would this conduct have upon his future condition if Universalism is true? Would it make any difference? Would there not still be in reserve for him a crown of glory? Would he not, as Paul the traitor, have as high a seat, as loud a song, as clear a voice, a diadem as bright, as he now will have as Paul the triumphant warrior, Paul the successful runner, Paul the faithful steward, who resigned his life rather than yield up the faith? Would not he and Judas sit side by side upon their thrones of light, in the presence of that holy Being, whose body the one betrayed, and whose cause the

other abandoned into the hands of his enemies. If not, then Universalism is false. And if it was true, Paul could have known nothing of it; for his dying breath announces that, had he not *fought* a good fight, *finished* his course, and *kept* the faith, not only he would not have received a crown of life, but at last must have been a castaway.

RECAPITULATION.

I think no man can go forth from this investigation without the firmest convictions that Universalism is not of God. All nations have rejected it, and all rational minds fear a judgment to come. It presents doctrines at once novel and fatal — doctrines which the entire Christian world have rejected. We have seen, Universalists themselves being judges, that the nation of whom Christ came, and to which he preached, believed in the eternal punishment of the wicked; that Jesus and the apostles used language designed to confirm this opinion; that Universalism can only blot out this doctrine from the Bible by the most violent wresting and dreadful perversion of the word of God. We have proved that the reasoning which deduces Universalism from the Bible, would also deduce paganism or atheism; and that the same reasoning which blots out future woe, and quenches the fires of hell, ends the joy of the blessed, and puts out the light that surrounds the throne of God and the Lamb. And not only so, but Universalism does *violence to the* plainest teachings of Scripture, and *makes the* inspired penmen either incompetent or dis-

honest. It demands of you the sacrifice of the faith of the church, the piety and learning of eighteen centuries; it invites you to mock at sin, to laugh at the judgment, and to scoff at threatened danger. It tells its deluded votaries that if they do not enter in at the strait gate, if they do not lay up treasures in heaven, if they do not in this world repent and believe, it will be as well with them beyond the grave. Though they die thieves and drunkards, adulterers and fornicators, they shall at last be saved; and all this though the Bible says that such shall not inherit the kingdom of God. (1 *Cor.* vi. 9, 10.)

Upon the ministers of Universalism the blood of souls must rest; their hands are stained with the crimson flood. Upon them the deep condemnation must fall of "handling the word of God deceitfully," of "wresting" the Bible to their own destruction, and that of others. May they be turned from their perilous and ruinous employ! May God "give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will"! (2 *Tim.* ii. 25, 26.)

Can any immortal souls be so unwise as to incur such risk as they must run in building upon such a foundation, and following such guides? How will they, when this season of probation is lost, awake to their situation only to say, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved"!

LECTURE IV.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM THE ARGUMENTS ADDUCED IN SUPPORT OF THE DOCTRINE.

ACTS xvii. 11.

AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.

In the discharge of his duty, as an ambassador of Jesus Christ, Paul visited Thessalonica. The Jews of that city were offended because Christ was preached among them; and they were enraged because he was preached by one, formerly of their own number, who was now preaching the faith that once he destroyed. Knowing that it would be impossible to answer or refute his reasonings, they first assailed his character; and then, gathering to themselves certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, they assaulted the house in which Paul lodged, and compelled him to depart from the city. He went by night to Berea. His reception there is thus described: "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."

This more noble conduct is recorded for our imi*tation. It* is a great thing to know what the Bible

teaches in relation to human duty, and human destiny, in regard to the effect this life has upon the next; and how much our conduct and character in this state of existence will result in our eternal weal or woe. The Bible gives plain instructions upon these important truths. So clearly is our duty revealed, that "the wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein." Though we may very properly avail ourselves of helps that we may understand the word of God, the responsibility returns upon us as individuals. We must hear and decide for ourselves; and to our own master we must finally stand or fall.

Universalists have always professed an ardent desire to have their sentiments examined. They invite and challenge inquiry. They complain that their faith is opposed as licentious; that it is rejected as untrue; and that many parts of the Bible are arrayed against it; while their expositions of Scripture are unnoticed, and the arguments urged in defence of their faith are passed by without examination.

One of the defenders of Universalism, who stands at the head of the sect, thus records the complaints of his brethren upon this point. He says, speaking of one who attempts to examine Universalism,—

"And what does he adduce? Why, nothing but the same texts that have been invariably quoted, for the same purpose, by his numberless predecessors, for the last twenty or thirty years, and as invariably explained with much care by Universalists in their replies and other writings. Not an *allusion to their interpretations* escapes in a single instance; not an *intimation that* any other meaning had ever been

pointed out, or attempted to be shown, than what he assigns. Let the opponents of Universalism, if they would be thought candid and honorable, change immediately their mode of warfare." (*Expositor*, vol. iii. 139, 140.)

Universalists cannot complain of this investigation. I purpose to do the very thing which they say has been left undone. I have already examined their interpretations of scriptures alleged against them. I shall now show that the proofs adduced in favor of Universalism do not sustain it; and that reason, nature, and the Bible, are arrayed against it. I take the ground that, if nothing could be said against its moral tendency; if no objections of any kind were urged against it; if it were to be tested simply by the amount of evidence it could summon in its own behalf,—all reasonable minds would be compelled to reject it on account of the entire want of evidence in its favor. The scriptures quoted in its defence have no reference to universal salvation. The arguments urged in its support, drawn from other sources than the Bible, are either sophistical, or they prove too much, and so prove nothing; or they prove the very opposite of what they are brought forward to maintain.

Universalism stands before us as an error of the first magnitude. If it does not preach against repentance, it removes all motive to it, by teaching that repentance is not needful for salvation. If men do not repent, they will not perish. So argue its advocates. If its instructions do not openly encourage vice, "it strengthens the hands of the wicked" by

assuring them, that, live well or ill, do good or not, keep God's law or break it, die a felon or a martyr, live in lust and die in crime,—all this, though it may subject them to some temporal inconvenience, will have no effect upon their future condition. Be pure in heart or vile, follow holiness or pollution, all will at last see God alike, and dwell with him forever.

But immortal souls should demand affirmative proofs, abundant, conclusive, irrefragable, before they rest upon a system, which, if true, will not hurt them if they reject it; and if false, must ruin, for both worlds, all who trust it. I shall prove, I think, that the evidence offered in its defence affords it no support.

My purpose is to say a few plain things in a plain way; to meet Universalism as it exists in the community; and so to present the subject as to commend it to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

The arguments advanced in behalf of Universalism are of a twofold nature—those drawn from the Bible, and those drawn from reason. In this lecture I shall confine my remarks to such as are drawn from the Bible. I select them as I used them when defending the system, and as they are now employed by others. I shall give them all the force they receive when used by the advocates of Universalism.

The following proposition I offer as the subject of this lecture:—THE ARGUMENTS ADDUCED FROM THE BIBLE IN FAVOR OF UNIVERSALISM DO NOT SUPPORT IT.

I. Gen. iii. 15: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall *bruise thy head*, and thou shalt bruise his *heel*."

It is a fact which any one so disposed may ascertain, that a large part of the proof-texts cited in favor of Universalism is found in the Old Testament; and yet, when pressed with the threatenings of the Old Testament, and called upon to explain texts like the following, "The wicked shall be turned into hell," "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt," (*Dan.* xii. 2,) Universalists tell us that such texts cannot refer to the future state, because the Old Testament does not reveal a *future* existence; and that its promises and threatenings are limited to *this* life. How, then, can universal salvation be taught in a book which has no reference to the future? If all the threatenings contained in it are bounded by time, so are all the promises. This answer is alone sufficient to sweep away the whole argument derived from the Old Testament.

But, not noticing this inconsistency any further, let us examine the texts said to teach Universalism, and see how they bear upon the question.

In what way does the passage quoted above prove the salvation of all men? It asserts that the head of the serpent shall be bruised; but what does this prove? It begins and ends with the victory of the seed of the woman over the seed of the serpent, but says nothing of the doom of the incorrigible. Universalists say that to bruise the head of the serpent is to conquer him, and deliver all who are subject to *his power*. But what will become of the millions *who have lived* and died in sin before this event

transpires. They cannot go where Christ has gone. (*John* viii. 24.) Paul informs us that all that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. (2 *Thess.* i. 8, 9.)

Moses announces the destruction of the serpent. Paul announces the destruction of impenitent men, who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction.* Does this language intimate that all men will be saved? Is it not plain that the text has no reference to universal salvation?

II. Gen. xxii. 18: "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

This is a prominent argument. I have no recollection of having ever heard a sermon in defence of Universalism, in which this text, or the repetition of the promise to Isaac and Jacob, did not hold a conspicuous place. Should we adopt the limitation which, in Mat. xxv. 32, Universalists apply to "*all nations*," it would be very difficult for them to prove that "all nations" in this place means *all men.*

That no people was to be excluded from the light and favor of the gospel, is true. Unlike the law of Moses, it extended to all nations. But that all men *in* those nations would believe the gospel, obey it, and be saved, the text cited does not assert. Not only is it true that the text does not prove universal salvation, but I am prepared to prove that it teaches the contrary doctrine.

St. Paul *understood* this passage, I presume, as *well as Universalists.* He was acquainted with this

promise; with the nature of the blessing, the terms upon which it was offered, and the extent to which it should reach.

In the third chapter of Galatians, he quotes, in the eighth verse, the very promise under consideration. He then goes on to show the relationship of the Gentiles, who should be justified by faith under the preaching of the gospel, to Abraham; and closes the chapter by showing that those who are Christ's, or in Christ by faith, be they Jew or Gentile, are "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the *promise*."

The plain meaning of the promise is this: Under the gospel there are no national disabilities, no national preferences. All nations stand upon the same level. The Jew is no more the child of Abraham than is the Gentile. None are the children of Abraham, but those who are "*Christ's*" by faith and obedience. If none but the seed of Abraham are heirs to this promise,—if none are Abraham's seed but those who are Christ's by faith and obedience,—then all who are not Christ's are not Abraham's seed, nor have they any part in that blessing which was to be offered to all nations. As to the question, "Who are Christ's?" Paul answers, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (*Rom.* viii. 9.)

The same truth is taught by Peter in the following words: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (*Acts* x. 34, 35.) Here we are told that men are accepted, not according to their *national*, but *their personal* character. The acceptable worshipper

was not exclusively found among the sons of Abraham; but, in every nation, those who "fear God," and "work righteousness, are accepted with him." If such only are accepted, then all who fear not God, and who do not work righteousness, are not accepted with him. I would ask if any can suppose that Christ could have sent the apostles to proclaim the salvation of all men, when it required a special revelation and heavenly vision to convince Peter that righteous men among the Gentiles would be saved.

The promise to Abraham included the gift of a Savior, who should turn men from their iniquities, and "redeem them from the curse of the law." Unlike the law, it was to exclude no nation from its benefits. The terms upon which the blessing was offered, were faith in Christ, and obedience to his commands. And though Christ will be preached to all nations, and "many will be redeemed to God by his blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," (*Rev.* v. 9,) yet all who "obey not the gospel," who "are not Christ's," who "have not his spirit," who "work not righteousness," will have no part in this blessing; they will perish as surely as if Christ had not died.

III. Isaiah xxv. 8: "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

This text may represent that class of proofs drawn from the Old Testament, in which blessings are promised to "all people," to "all men," to "all the ends of the earth."

Does the passage before us contain a promised

blessing for all men? When it is said, "He will wipe away tears from off all faces," does it include all men? If so, then the passage is a proof of Universalism. If not, then it has no reference to that system.

I presume that it is well understood that the phrases "all men" and "all people" do not necessarily include the whole human family. Of John the Baptist, it is said, "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and *all Judea*, and *all the region* round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." (*Matt.* iii. 5, 6.) We should hardly believe that man to be sane, who should attempt to prove, from these words, that every man, woman, and child, in Judea and the region round about Jordan, confessed their sins, and were baptized of John.

Again; some one said to John, "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and *all men come to him.*" (*John* iii. 26.) But did the high priest, the chief priests, the scribes, the elders, the Pharisees, and the great body of the Jews, come to Christ, and receive baptism at his hands? No one will advance such an idea. Then the phrase "all men," in the Bible, any more than in common discourse, does not always include the whole human family. If you ask, "As the phrase sometimes does include all our race, and sometimes not, how are we to know when it is limited, and when unlimited?" I reply, "The context *always limits* or restricts the application, when only a *large number* is intended." It does so in the cases just

alluded to. It does so in the Old Testament, when blessings are promised to all nations, and they are said to bow down before the Son of God. It does so in the text under consideration. That the prophet does not include all men in the promise that God will wipe away tears from off all faces, is evident from the connection. He is speaking of "*his people*," the people of God. As to them, "death shall be swallowed up in victory;" from all their eyes "tears shall be wiped away;" all "rebuke shall be taken from them;" and they shall say, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us."

He then turns to speak of another class; of those who are not the people of God, and who have no part in these blessings; but for whom a different destiny is reserved. They are to be "trodden down under the Lord, even as straw is trodden down for the dung-hill;" and "he shall bring down their pride together with the spoils of their hands." (v. 10, 11.) But how can this be true of any one, if all the human family is included in the promise? Every one must see that the prophet, inspired of God, speaks first of what God will do to his friends, and then of what he will do to his foes.

This remark applies to other texts of the same general character, which Universalists quote to prove that all will be saved. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." (*Isaiah* ii. 2.) But the connection proves that no reference is made to the eternal world;

for the writer adds, that in *that day* "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled;" they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and each shall in *that day* "cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, to the moles and to the bats." (v. 11, 19, 20.) These things are predicted as about to take place in that day in which all nations shall flow to the house of the Lord. Hence they will not take place in the immortal world; and the promise yields no support to Universalism.

IV. Isaiah lv. 10, 11: "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

This passage is called an unconditional promise, implying no conditions, involving no contingency. The argument is this: "The snow and rain are sent to the earth to accomplish a particular purpose, — to water the earth, to make it bud, to give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater. They always do this, and never return to heaven void. The gospel was given to save the world; it cannot fail of its object, any more than the snow and rain; and, as it will accomplish the design of Him who sent it, as certainly as do the snow and rain, all men must be saved."

This interpretation destroys the spirit of the passage. The figures introduced in the text expose the sophistry of the argument, and put down the false interpretation.

The passage presents no unconditional promise. It ffers a contingent blessing; one that rests upon the oöperation of man with God. Upon this the promsed favor rests, and without it no good can be claimed r expected. We have an analogy between the inluences of the snow and rain and the influence of the ;ospel. "*As* the snow and rain, *so* shall my word be." Where the one is limited by human neglect, he other is. In whatever sense the former demands abor and diligence to insure seed for sowing and bread for eating, the latter requires human exertion ind obedience to secure salvation.

Has man nothing to do to obtain the blessings which attend the snow and rain? Will the earth be fruitful, and give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, if man folds his hands in indolence? Will corn grow upon the mountains, or grain wave in the valleys, if man performs no labor? May the farmer recline all day upon his couch, or spend his months in folly and pleasure; and when his industrious neighbor reaps a golden harvest, may he put in his sickle, and reap what he never sowed? Can he gather a crop, who never planted? Will he find food without labor, because God has promised that the snow and rain shall never fail to water the earth, and give bread to the eater?

Yet to this absurd conclusion must we come, if the argument of Universalists is sound. For, on their supposition, man has no labor to perform, no fallow ground to break up, no sweat to spend for bread. *But let two men* try the experiment. Let *he one employ well* the season of preparation, use

the means God has appointed, break up the ground, and sow with a liberal hand. Let the other refuse to labor; let him go from place to place, arguing and disputing about the promise of God; and attempting to dissuade men from labor, on the pretence that God had made an unconditional promise that the eater should have bread; and that it would be wrong to distrust God by ploughing, sowing, and toiling, when the snow and rain were to do the work, and bring the blessing. Which of these men's places would you desire in the season of harvest?

Carry this subject up to the judgment; and tell me whose character you would prefer to bear in that day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be known. Would you choose the character of the reckless and impious man, who has laid to his soul the flattering unction that God is too good to punish sin; who has wasted this life, abused all his privileges, and died in sin? or that of the man who has feared God, whose whole aim has been to please God, to secure that good part which shall never be taken from him, and to die the death of the righteous?

Were all men to cease from labor, God would be faithful; the sun would shine, the seasons roll around, and the rains from heaven, and the feathery snow, would fall till time should be no more. But the disobedient and unfaithful would still be unblessed. For to secure the fruits of the earth, not only must the showers fall, but the ground must be broken up and prepared; painful labor must be borne, and diligence and care alone can obtain what God has promised. The indolent or unfaithful will have no share in the

promise. They will adopt the lamentation of old, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, we find this figure introduced with great effect, sustaining the principles we have here maintained.

"For the earth, which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God. But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." (*Heb.* vi. 7, 8.)

In this passage, the human family is likened unto the earth, watered by the rain that cometh oft upon it. A part is *dressed* or cultivated; this bringeth forth fruit for man, and is blessed of God. Another part is neglected, and, though watered by the same rain, and warmed by the beams of the same sun, it is rejected; it is nigh unto cursing, and its end is to be burned. So with men. Those who obey the truth are blessed of God; those who are disobedient are rejected and accursed.

The same sun that warms and vivifies the well-tilled field, *hardens* the barren soil. The same moisture that makes the well-prepared ground abundantly fruitful, makes the neglected land a waste of thorns and briers, whose end is to be burned.

God's word is now ready to do his bidding. Already has it blessed men in a thousand ways. But if men harden their hearts, and refuse to obey the truth, they cannot be saved. Nor will the word return void. It will have *some* effect. Like the

rain which makes the land a fruitful field, or a spot upon which fuel for the flames is found,—like the sun, that either invigorates or hardens the soil,—the gospel, which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," becomes "a savor of death unto death" to all who reject it. (2 *Cor.* ii. 14—16.)

V. Isaiah xlv. 23, 24: "I have sworn by myself; the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength."

Universalists cite this to prove that God has pledged himself by an oath to save all men. They call this "a most striking passage." So it is; but not in favor of Universalism. This will be made apparent when we consider the *time* when the subjection spoken of will take place. Universalists say that it will be fulfilled in the day when all shall be saved. But St. Paul, who spoke by the inspiration of God, assures us that the passage is to have its fulfilment in the day of judgment.

"But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. *For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.*" (*Rom.* xiv. 10, 11.) The prediction which the Universalist applies to the salvation of all men, St. Paul applies to the judgment of the great day. Which of them must be right? Does the prophecy teach

that all men will be saved? or that all, however stubborn or submissive, will have to bow the knee at last before the Judge, and receive from him their sentence?

But who shall receive in that day, the day of judgment, "righteousness and strength"? All men? By no means. The *seed of Israel* are to find in him justification and glory. Those who are Christ's are the seed of Israel. All are to come to the Lord; all are to bow the knee; all are to give an account of themselves to God; many to "be justified and glorified;" many to "be ashamed and confounded." (v. 24, 25.) In this passage, Universalists take for granted the very point they are required to prove. They assume that all are to bow the knee willingly, that all are to be willing subjects; while the very language shows that it is a compulsory submission, a bowing of those subdued by the power of the conqueror; for, while all bow the knee, many are ashamed and confounded. As I shall refer to this point again in my remarks upon 1 Cor. xv., I leave this text, simply adding that while Universalists rest their system in a great measure upon this text, it speaks in decisive terms against them. For God has sworn by himself to bring the rebellious to punishment. And in the day of judgment, when all the nations of the earth shall appear before God, then all must bow the knee as friends or as foes; the one will receive righteousness and glory; the other will be ashamed and confounded, when they hear the sentence, "Depart from me; I know you not."

VI. Lam. iii. 31: "For the Lord will not cast off

forever." Of whom spoke the prophet? of the human race? of all men? No; but of his nation, whom he calls "the daughter of Zion" and "the daughter of Judah." The connection proves that it was the nation whom God would not cast off forever.

Does he refer to the future state, when he makes the declaration we have quoted? Does he mean to teach, in this place, that, in the future life, not one of the Jewish nation would be lost? The context shows that he had no reference to the future life at all. His nation at that moment were cast off. They were in captivity at Babylon. The city of Jerusalem, once full of people, now was solitary. The princess among the provinces was now tributary. "Judah," says the prophet, "is gone into captivity, because of affliction, and because of great servitude; she dwelleth among the heathen; she findeth no rest; all her persecutors overtook her between the straits." "The Lord hath afflicted her." "Her children are gone into captivity before the enemy." (*Lam.* i. 1—3, 5.)

The people of Israel in captivity knew not whether they should ever return to their own loved city, or they and their children be doomed to hopeless servitude. The prophet received encouragement from God, that their captivity should at some time end; that God would not cast off forever, but, in his own time, would bring them back from their captivity, and restore them to their own land.

Whoever will read the book of Lamentations, will see that the prophet has no reference in the text to the future life; that the people of whom he spoke were his own nation, the Jews; and that he speaks of no

other casting off than what they at that moment were enduring, when "their inheritance was turned to strangers, and their house to aliens;" when they "drunk their water for money, and their wood was sold unto them;" when their "princes were hanged, and the faces of their elders were not honored;" when "the joy of the heart ceased, and the dance was turned into mourning." (*Lam.* v. 2—15.)

Though at that time, and under those circumstances, the Lord would not cast off that people forever, it by no means proves that he will not do so to the impenitent who die in their sins. Indeed, were such the meaning of this passage, it would only array scripture against scripture; for the Bible expressly asserts that God will finally cast off all who die in sin.

David, in his dying advice to Solomon, says, "And thou, Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and a willing mind;—if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." (1 *Chron.* xxviii. 9.)

Paul says that those "who know not God, and that obey not the gospel," "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 *Thess.* i. 8, 9.) The same truth fell from the lips of the Savior: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." (*Matt.* xxv. 46.)

God had cast off his people. They were in captivity at the time the prophet wrote; though God purposed to restore them. But this no more proves that God will not finally cast off the impenitent, or

that all men will be saved, than does the fact that the governor of a state has pardoned one criminal out of the penitentiary, prove that none will ever after be sent there; or, if sent, be obliged to remain till the expiration of their sentence. In the judgment, God will cast off, and cast off forever. Then all who are filthy, unholy, and unclean, will so remain forever.

VII. Acts iii. 21: "Whom the heaven must receive, until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

Universalists here assume the very point in debate—that this restitution of all things is the salvation of all men. But by what authority do they ascribe this meaning to the phrase "restitution of all things"? Does the word *restitution* mean the salvation of souls? We find the following question put by the disciples to the Savior: "Wilt thou at this time *restore* (the same word that is rendered *restitution*) again the kingdom to Israel? (*Acts* i. 6.) Did they mean to *save* the kingdom of Israel in the sense in which Universalists use that word when speaking of the salvation of all men? Had the kingdom of Israel been once saved, and was Christ to save it again? The disciples were Jews. The kingdom of Israel was in the hands of the heathen. The disciples supposed that the Messiah would be a temporal sovereign, as well as spiritual; and that, when the appointed time should arrive, he would hurl the usurper from the throne of David, and restore the kingdom again to the royal line. The question was, whether the *time* had arrived in which that event should take place. In this place, then, the

word "restore," or "restitution," does not mean to save in the eternal world.

Again it is written, "Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things." (*Matt.* xvii. 11.) Here we have the same phrase, "restore all things," denoting a restitution of all things. But did the Savior mean to teach that, before he could begin his own mission, John the Baptist must first come, and save all men? For what, then, did he come, if all were saved by his forerunner? We see, then, that the word *restitution* does not mean salvation in the future world; nor does the "restitution of all things" include the salvation of all men.

The context affords abundant proof that the author of the text under consideration did not believe in universal salvation. Though he was a firm believer in all the restitution of which God's holy prophets had spoken, he was also a firm believer in the truth that many will perish.

To those who listened to his preaching, Peter said, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." (v. 19.) Here is a duty enjoined: "repent, and be converted." Great inducement is offered: "that your sins may be blotted out:" you shall be pardoned, and be as though you had never sinned. The time is specified: "when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." "The times of refreshing," and "the restitution of all things," are the same; to enjoy which, men must repent and be converted. But if they do not repent, and are not converted, then their

sins will not be blotted out; nor will they enjoy that "restitution of which the prophets have spoken." And the apostle further adds, "And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people," (v. 23,) —a most singular conclusion, if the sermon were designed to teach that no one shall be destroyed!

That the kingdoms of this world will yet be restored to him to whom they belong, is true. But that very event is, in all parts of the Bible, coupled with the destruction of the enemies of the Son of God. "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." (1 *Cor.* xv. 25.) "From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." (*Heb.* x. 13.) "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me." (*Luke* xix. 27.)

VIII. 1 Tim. ii. 4: "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." Who has ever expressed a doubt upon this matter? The gift of his Son, the perpetuity of the gospel, the offer of pardon to all who will repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, are abundant proof that God is willing, nay, desirous, that all men should be saved, and "come to the knowledge of the truth." He will have all men *now* come to the knowledge of the truth; but do they? If Universalism is truth, all men have not, and millions more will never, in this world, come to the knowledge of it. God is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 *Peter* iii. 9.) But do all men repent? Do none of our race perish, allowing

even the Universalist definition of the word "perish"?

By the prophet the Almighty inquires, "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?" (*Ezek.* xviii. 23.) And do not the wicked die?

If men perish, though God is not willing they should; if he wishes them to repent, and yet they do not; if he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, and yet the wicked die — then the simple fact, that God desires the salvation of all men, does not prove that all men will be saved.

The reason why men will perish, is not because God is not willing they should be saved. Christ has assigned the reason: "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (*John* v. 40.)

If any suppose that the will of man can in no sense prevail against the will of God, and, if God wills, in any sense, the salvation of all men, all men will eventually be saved, — I reply, that Christ sought the salvation of the Jews; he prayed for it, labored for it, and *would* have brought them to that repentance which is unto life; but he could not. And the reason why he could not save them, he gives in these words — "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, —— how often *would* I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye *would not!*" (*Matt.* xxiii. 37.) Christ *would* have saved them, but they *would not* be saved. So God will have all men now repent; he commands it; but men will not. He will have all men come to the knowledge of the truth, and be saved; but men refuse to obey; they will not come to Christ, and have life. Thus they

perish by their own hand. The loss of the soul is a *suicidal* act; and as much more dreadful than the rash act that ends this life, as eternity is more important than time.

IX. 1 Tim. iv. 10: "We trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe."

Although Universalists place much reliance on this text, it is worthy of notice that it teaches no such doctrine as they mean to sustain by it, and even bears upon the face of it a doctrine which Universalists reject.

Are all men *now* saved, in the sense in which they contend the human race will be in the eternal world? No one pretends this. The argument is, that all men *will be* saved; that the time *will come* in which all will be redeemed. Then why cite this text to sustain such an idea? It gives no promise of a *coming* salvation. It does not say that all men can be saved, may be saved, or will be saved. It asserts a present truth; it announces a fact already existing, that God *is* the special Savior of all that believe, and also *is* the Savior of all men. That he was, at the time these words were penned, the special Savior of believers, no one will dispute. Then was he eighteen hundred years ago, in the sense intended, the Savior of all men.

This text teaches, what all believers in revelation allow, that in one sense God is the Savior of all men: in another, and a higher sense, he was the Savior of those only who believe.

To press this text into the support of Universalism, it must be made to teach, not only that, in a sense, God is now the Savior of all men,—for that is admit-

ted, — but that he will be their eternal Savior. That God is the Preserver of all men, and in that sense their Savior, we admit. That he is not their eternal Savior, we are prepared to prove. The author of the text under consideration has settled the point in debate: "And being made perfect, he became the *Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.*" (*Heb.* v. 9.) Now, in whatever sense God is, or may be, the Savior of all men, he is not, he never will be, the eternal Savior of any who do not obey him. And the exact number saved will be neither more nor less than all who obey our Lord Jesus Christ.

X. 1 Cor. xv. 22: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The fifteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians, Universalists have long claimed, as teaching, in the plainest terms, that all men will be saved. Some have called it the "Magna Charta of Universalism." I know of scarce a chapter in the Bible that presents a stronger, and a more unanswerable, argument against Universalism. Take, as an illustration, the proof-text under examination — a text familiar to all who have read or heard any thing in favor of this system: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This text is presented with an air of triumph, as if it must settle the controversy, and close the mouth of every opponent. But what does it prove? Nothing in favor of universal salvation. It simply asserts that all men will be made alive. But what their characters will be, or what will be their final destination, after they are made alive, it does not inform us. It is but another part of that teaching which assures us

that, in the resurrection, all who are in their graves will come forth by the power of Christ; that all the dead, small and great, will hear his voice, and stand at the bar of God. But will all who are made alive by the command of Christ, have one resurrection, one character, one destiny? This proved, and Universalism is proved. The connection, however, settles the question the other way. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." (v. 22, 23.) But, if all men have one character in the resurrection, why does Paul inform us that every one will be raised "in his own order"? All do not belong to the same order when they die; nor will they when they are raised. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." (*Rev.* xxii. 11.) If there is to be no distinction in the resurrection-state, why does the apostle speak of those "who are Christ's at his coming"? How plainly are we instructed that all are not Christ's! "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (*Rom.* viii. 9.) As men die, so will they be raised; and so will they continue forever.

In the argument drawn from the twenty-eighth verse, by which Universalists attempt to prove universal salvation from the subjection of all things to Christ, they present a false assumption. They proceed very gravely to *prove* the fact that all things will be subdued — a truth which no one denies. And then they *assume* the point, that the subjection is spiritual or voluntary, and not forcible or compulsory.

But this is the very question at issue. The point to be proved by Universalists is, not whether all things shall be subdued, which no one disputes; but is the subjection a willing one? This proved, and they have gained the argument. But that the argument is against them, the context clearly shows.

Speaking of the conquest of Christ, the apostle says, "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." (v. 25.) But is this a willing subjection? To be put under the feet of a conqueror, is the subjection that awaits the enemies of the Son of God. But is this the same as salvation? Then why not put all men under his feet? Why speak of any of them as enemies, if they are holy and submissive subjects? All, indeed, will be subject to him; a subjection bringing salvation to all who are Christ's; a subjection to be trodden under his feet, for all who obey not the gospel. The figure here introduced is borrowed from the customs of ancient warriors. A sovereign subdues a rebellious province. He enters it with the determination to put down all opposition. His friends, who have been faithful to him, he rewards. His enemies he conquers, and places his feet upon their necks, as a token that they are subdued. So Christ is to reign till his enemies are conquered, and placed where they can do his government and his friends no more harm. His friends are then rewarded, after which there can be no escape for his enemies; for, as soon as they are placed under his feet, Christ gives up the office of Mediator, and there is no more redemption. Men cannot be saved without a mediator in this world, nor can they be in the next. But

there they will have no mediator. When all things are thus subdued, and the enemies of Christ are trodden under his feet, "then comes the end" of the mediatorial kingdom. The Son gives up the kingdom to his Father; and, without a viceroy in his government, God reigns "all in all."

Thus we perceive that the whole chapter is as decidedly against the system of Universalism, as if the apostle had written it with the intent to oppose that delusion.

XI. Rev. xxi. 4: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain."

Although it is painful to follow up men whose business it is to wrest the Bible to their own destruction, still it is hard to suppress a smile, at seeing Universalists appeal to the book of Revelation to sustain their system, when they have always maintained that the whole book had its fulfilment nearly eighteen centuries ago. They are compelled to do this, in order to avoid the otherwise unanswerable arguments against their system which this book contains, particularly the twentieth chapter. Then, after arguing that the book had its fulfilment centuries ago, they select a part of it, and urge it in defence of the salvation of all men in the future state. This inconsistency in men "who oppose themselves," has been rebuked by one of the sect.

Mr. H. Ballou, 2d, says, "Universalists have not wholly ceased to quote, as proof of the final reconciliation of all men, the following text:—'Ev-

ery creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, forever and ever;' *a text which, if we mistake not their views concerning the general plan of this book, they can by no means suppose, on careful reflection, to refer to a period yet future.* It should not be forgotten that all the passages we have set down are taken from those very chapters which are now universally regarded as having their fulfilment on the earth; *and that, unless we renounce this opinion, we are, of course, precluded from adducing them as proof of the state of things in another world.*" (*Expositor*, iii. 196.)

But to return to the passage that we have introduced. No one supposes that it will remain unfulfilled. All who have a part in that promise will have their tears wiped away, and for them there will be no more pain, no more sorrow, nor crying. But is this a blessing promised to all men without distinction? It is not. The people of God are to receive this favor; while "the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." (v. 8.) In this chapter, as in other portions of the Bible, God declares what he will do in the eternal world to his friends, and what he will do to his foes.

XII. I shall close with remarking that the arguments drawn from the nature of God do not sustain Universalism.

He is love. But evil, sin, woe, and death, exist, in this life, in harmony with this love. The good share in this woe, often more than the wicked. The absurdity of the argument is glaring. God, it is said, cannot punish men in the future world, because he is love; when he has been doing the self-same thing in this world for thousands of years.

God is powerful. But he will have no more power in the eternal world than he has in this; no more love; no more goodness. He can make all men as happy in this life as Universalists say he will make them in the future, or he cannot. If he cannot now, he never can. If he will not now, he never will.

May God lead you into all truth! Of none of you may it ever be said, "They received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved: and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." (2 *Thess.* ii. 10—12.)

LECTURE V.

UNIVERSALISM NOT SUSTAINED BY THE ARGUMENTS IN ITS FAVOR DERIVED FROM THE LIGHT OF NATURE

GAL. i. 23.

BUT THEY HAD HEARD ONLY THAT HE WHICH PERSECUTED US IN TIMES PAST, NOW PREACHETH THE FAITH WHICH ONCE HE DESTROYED.

I CONSIDERED in the last lecture the principal proofs advanced from Scripture in favor of the salvation of all men. The arguments drawn from reason, nature, and other sources, remain to be examined. No one can attend carefully to the proof which Universalists produce from the Bible, without being struck with the meagre amount they bring forward, even with the help of their principles of interpretation, and the most violent wresting of the sacred word. In order to number up so many as a hundred scriptural arguments, they are compelled to cut up some passages into three or four parts, making a separate argument of each. They are also obliged to repeat the same promise several times, to change the form of a proof once before presented, and at last to add, as *scriptural* evidence, an *inference or two* of their own. (See *Guide to Univ.* 23.)

If the Bible contained not one line that could by any possible means be wrested into the support of Universalism, it would make little difference with the advocates of the system. Their proof of Universalism is outside of the Bible, and independent of it. I have often heard them say, in the pulpit and out, that they would reject the Bible, if they thought it did not teach Universalism. Universalism relies on proofs independent of revelation. Its advocates first announce what God is, and what he is not; what he will do, and what he will not; what he can do, and what he cannot. With every thing established as to what God is, what he will do and can do, they approach the Bible. Their language is, "*If* the Bible is a revelation from God, then Universalism will be found in it; and if any part of it seems to countenance a doctrine opposed to Universalism, either that portion must be explained away, or the Bible thrown aside." The Bible, therefore, has little to do in settling the question of the truth or falsehood of Universalism. The sect would get along much better without it. So much of it seems to be against them, that at least two thirds of all their preaching is designed to explain away these unfavorable appearances. When they read a chapter in public, great care is needful to select the *right kind* of chapter; or else to accompany it with an explanation, so that the bane and antidote may go together. Moreover, the proofs adduced from the Bible in favor of Universalism, are so irrelevant, that Universalists would succeed far better without the Bible than with it. On this account, most of the arguments urged in support of the system

are drawn from sources independent of the Bible. To the consideration of these, I will now ask your attention.

. ARGUMENT DRAWN FROM THE CHARACTER OF GOD AS A FATHER.

God is said to be the Father of all men. He is better, more kind, more tender, than an earthly parent. Therefore he cannot punish men with eternal death.

But he is now doing, and has, ever since the creation of man, been doing, what no earthly father would do, and what no good government would allow him to do, even if he had the disposition. The providence of God every day is a practical refutation of the argument we now have under consideration. What father would drown his family, as God drowned the old world? What father would burn his children, as God burned his in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah? What father would make his children suffer from woe, sickness, pain, sin, and death, such as beset our race, and encompass them on every side? Now, one of two things is true; either these things are consistent with the character of God as a tender Father, or they are not. If not, then God is not now a Father; and the Universalist argument falls to the ground. But if God can drown and burn his children, plague them with famine, pestilence, disease, and death, and still be a "tender Father," then he can do all that the Bible announces that he will do to the wicked in the future world, and yet be as kind a Father *there, as here.*

Before sin entered into the world, God was the Father of Adam, who, for all that, did not remain holy. Why, then, should that relation be certain to restore our race to holiness, when they have long and wilfully disobeyed God? Before any had suffered the miseries of *this* life, God was as much their Father as he has been in any age since; but that relation did not save them from affliction, though an earthly parent would have kept his children from woe, if it were in his power. The argument drawn from the paternal character of God is decisive against Universalism. He does, and ever has done, what no earthly parent would dare to do. And whatever is consistent with his unchangeable character in one age, is consistent with it in all ages, and in all worlds.

But it is not true that all men are the children of God, in the higher and spiritual sense of that term. There is a sense in which God is the Father of all men, as there is a sense in which he is the Savior of all men. But no truth is more clearly taught in the Bible than this,—that men by nature are not the spiritual children of God.

Men are said to become the children of God by "adoption." (*Rom.* viii. 15.) A man cannot adopt his own child, which is already as much his child as it can be. But he may take a child not his own, and make it his by adoption. If all men are the children of God by nature, then are they not so by adoption. But if men only become children by being adopted into his family, then those not adopted are not children, nor have they any part in the divine inheritance. We are told expressly, "They which

are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God." (*Rom.* ix. 8.)

If any people upon the earth could claim God as their Father without a change of heart, that people was the Israelites. In opposition to the Savior, they boasted of their sonship. But did he allow their claim? "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." (*John* viii. 44.) Men cannot at the same time be the children of God and the children of the devil, any more than they can serve both God and Mammon. The beloved disciple assures us, that "in this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil;" the one doing good, the other evil. (1 *John* iii. 10.)

You perceive in this instance the common error of all Universalist reasoning. It applies to all men what is promised only to the obedient. It makes no discrimination between that which is promised to all men, and that which is offered as a reward for duty done or obedience rendered. I close my notice of this argument with a full assurance, that it does not sustain Universalism.

II. MERCY OF GOD.

Those declarations in the Bible which assert that God "is merciful," that "his tender mercies are over all his works," and that "his mercy endureth forever," are cited as proof that Universalism is true.

Upon no subject have men so vague and erroneous notions as upon mercy. All believe in the mercy of God. But what that is, to what extent, and under

what circumstances, it may be exercised, and what may hinder its interposition, few seem to understand. And Universalists, when they talk about the mercy of God, have evidently no just conception of the subject on which they speak. For, instead of being an argument in favor of Universalism, the fact that God is a God of mercy, proves their system false. Multitudes repose a delusive confidence in what they call the mercy of God. They think they may indulge in sin, live in all lust, and die in crime, and at last be saved, because God is plenteous in mercy.

But what is mercy? It is not merely goodness. Goodness led to the creation of angels and men, and to the making of provision for their happiness. But mercy has nothing to do with *innocent* beings. It can be exercised only toward the guilty and undeserving. Where no guilt is, there can be no mercy. Goodness blesses the innocent; mercy, the guilty, and only the guilty.

It is not justice. It is the opposite. Justice deals with men as they deserve; mercy, contrary to their deserts. Justice by no means clears the guilty; but mercy shows favor where punishment is due.

Mercy can be shown only to those on whom it would be just to visit the evil from which mercy proposes to save them. In all other cases, men want only justice. It is no *mercy* in a ruler, that he does not imprison his innocent subject; for there would be no *justice* in the act. It is no act of mercy to open the prison-doors to those who have been unjustly imprisoned; they ask no mercy; they ask only justice. To release a prisoner at the expiration of his term of

imprisonment, is not mercy; he can demand liberation as a right. He has satisfied the demand of the law, and is entitled to a discharge as an act of simple justice. In these cases there is no room for mercy or grace. Mercy, then, is *pardoning* power, or favor shown to guilty men. The *innocent* do not need it; for mercy always implies ill-desert in those who receive it. The words of penitence are ever a confession of sin. No man would claim exemption from punishment on the ground of mercy, who could appeal to justice for protection.

Universalists affirm that they have the only worthy and expanded views of divine mercy. They charge others with making God all justice. But with them, to what does mercy amount? They are shocked at the idea of future woe. They assure us that men do not *deserve hell;* and God is too merciful to send men there. What! God too merciful to send men to hell, when they do not *deserve* to go there! Absurd! There can be no mercy in the case. If men go to hell, it will, on Universalist grounds, be for want of *justice* in God, not for want of mercy.

What great thing is it to save men, who are almost, if not quite, innocent? who deserve little or no punishment from the hand of God? Is it any great stretch of skill for a physician to cure a headache which a night's slumber would have removed, and which would have done no great harm if not removed at all? If it would be unjust to cast men into hell, it is no mercy to save them from it. What have men to do with mercy who can claim exemption from hell on the ground of justice?

Again; it is said that men are punished as much as they deserve in the present life; and God is too merciful to send them away into everlasting punishment. But what room is there for mercy, when the criminal has in his own person answered the demands of the law? Can you pardon a man who has served out his term of imprisonment? Will he thank the officer for his *clemency* in opening the prison-door, when it could lawfully be kept closed no longer? He wants no mercy; he has satisfied the claims of justice, and can *demand* his liberation as a *right*. If Universalism be true, and men are all punished as much as they deserve, what has mercy to do in the salvation of our race? You cannot pardon a criminal who is punished to the extent of the law. A physician cannot cure a man who has healed himself. You cannot save a person from drowning who by his own exertions has reached the shore. A governor cannot remit the penalty, after it has been fully executed upon the convict. And yet we are told that these are the only worthy views of mercy! A sinner becomes his own savior. Compassion, grace, love, and forgiveness, are swept away by these exclusive magnifiers of the divine mercy, which turns out to be an empty pretence. Nothing remains but stern, exact, and even-handed justice.

If God is a God of mercy, then there is guilt, deep and awful, from which mercy offers to save men. Its conditions are plainly written. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have *mercy* upon him; and to our God, for he will *abundantly* pardon." (*Isaiah* lv. 7.) If, then, the

wicked do not abandon their ways and their thoughts, and turn unto the Lord, he will not have mercy upon him, nor will he abundantly pardon. That the mercy of God may be exercised to some, at the same time others are destroyed, we learn from Ps. cxxxvi. 13—20.

III. NATURE OF THE GOSPEL.

The Universalists argue thus: "The gospel is good tidings to all men, to every creature. If it is good tidings, it cannot announce endless misery; for that would be good tidings to no one. Hence endless misery cannot be true."

This argument wholly overlooks the nature of the gospel, and the things which make it welcome and cheering to all who understand it. The design of the gospel is not to threaten men with endless death, but to offer them salvation from that death, to which they were already exposed. When there is no danger, there can be no deliverance. To make a message welcome or good, men must feel themselves to be exposed to an evil, from which the message promises that they shall be delivered. To go through a country, crying, "Peace, peace! glorious tidings! there is no war, and never will be any!" would only excite a smile at the folly of the messenger. No one would feel any interest in the message, while no one is exposed to danger.

Universalists make the gospel an unmeaning message. They go about, crying, "Glorious news! *blessed tidings! unbounded* salvation!" And when

inquired of, as to the nature of their joyful message, they gravely tell us that men were never "in danger of hell-fire;" God is not angry with the wicked; and all men will certainly be saved, though Christ had not died. They tell us that we were in danger of nothing, and shall be saved from nothing. What, then, is the gospel to us? It proposes no deliverance, for there is no peril. It offers no atonement, for men never were exposed to God's wrath. It presents no salvation, for men never have lost their title to heaven.

What interest could a nation take in the professed ability of a man to deliver it from war, famine, or oppression, if peace had never been disturbed, plenty had always crowned their board, and misrule or lawlessness had never triumphed one hour? What interest would a man feel in a professed cure for the consumption, if no one had ever been afflicted with a pulmonary complaint?

The gospel is a good message, because it comes to deliver men from fearful evils to which they are exposed, and from which there is no escape but through the gospel. It is good tidings *to all people*, because all are liable to the evil from which it comes to save them. The knowledge of impending danger makes a message welcome which offers deliverance; and the greater the danger, the greater the joy to hear of relief.

Men are exposed to eternal death. There can be no evil to compare with this. Angels, who know what an awful thing it is to be lost, rejoiced when they knew that, for men thus exposed, a way of

escape was provided. There can be no message so joyous, as that which offers pardon to rebels doomed to die. And the gospel is good in its nature, and in its intent, though all men should refuse to hear or obey, and consequently perish in their sins.

In no case does it abate from the value of a message, when, in addition to the benefits of receiving it, you add the consequences, awful as they may be, of rejecting it.

A criminal is condemned to die. On certain conditions, the government proposes a pardon. An officer enters the cell of the prisoner, and says, "There is yet hope, though you deserve to die. I am the bearer of good tidings. You may obtain a pardon on certain rational and necessary conditions. Accept them, and you shall live and be happy." The prisoner hesitates. The messenger then informs him of the awful consequences of not complying: it is the only way of escape; and, if this is rejected, he must perish. But does this change the gracious nature of the message?

Famine sweeps over a land, and its inhabitants fall before it, and are consumed with hunger. A messenger is sent to inform that suffering nation that, in a place easy of access, "there is bread enough and to spare." This is good tidings to all. But does it change the kind nature of the message, when it is added, "If you do not accept this offer, you must die"? Pestilence rages in a city, unsettling public confidence, carrying terror into every family, and sending great numbers to an untimely grave. Relief is found, and offered to that diseased and dying

city. The welcome sound that deliverance is at hand, that the pestilence can be stayed, falls upon the ear like pardon to the condemned. But does the announcement cease to be "good tidings of great joy to all" the diseased, when the messenger assures them, that all who refuse the proffered aid must die?

The gospel does not *create* eternal death. Ages before it came, men were exposed to the wrath of God, and condemned to perish. All unbelievers are now under condemnation, (*John* iii. 18;) and the gospel is preached to "save them that believe." (1 *Cor.* i. 21.) If men reject the overtures of pardon, and refuse to believe and obey the gospel, it does not condemn them. They were condemned before it came. It simply leaves them to that condemnation, wherein they were already involved, and from which it could have saved them if they would. So we read, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (*John* iii. 36.) "He that despised Moses' law died *without* mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God?" (*Heb.* x. 28, 29.)

Suppose a province to be in a state of revolt. The sovereign sends an ambassador to treat with the rebellious state. He announces to them their guilt, and assures them that they deserve the severest punishment. But he adds, "I am the bearer of good tidings *to you all.* Your sovereign desires not your death; he

ot willing that any should perish.' There is
›n offered to you all, and the terms are easy upon
h it rests. Obey, and you shall live." They
e to obey. The messenger does not condemn
. They were condemned before he came, and
ıat very account he visited them with proffered
veness. When they refuse to hear and obey, he
draws, and leaves them to that condemnation
h already rested upon them, and from which
rould have delivered them.

› comes the gospel. It does not condemn men.
the fact that our race were previously condemned
ernal death, gives the gospel all its value. If one
›es, it is good; if more, it is good. But it would
›od in nature, good in intent, though all should
e to hear, and should stumble and perish. The
el is every where "a savor of life unto life, or
eath unto death." (2 *Cor.* ii. 15, 16.)

IV. NATURE OF PUNISHMENT.

niversalists argue that men are punished for their
good; and that punishment ceases to be just
n it secures not the good of the persons punished.
nen are never punished but for their own ben-
it is thence argued that punishment cannot be
ess.

ut is this true, that men are always punished
ı reference to themselves, rather than to the state
community? For whose benefit is a murderer
to death? for his own, or that of others? Is the
incarcerated for life for his own good, or for

the protection of the innocent? For whose advantage was the old world drowned, and Sodom burned? their own, or that of others? Was it to introduce them at once into heaven, or to admonish those who hereafter should live ungodly? (2 *Peter* ii. 5, 6.) It is not true, then, that punishment always secures the good of the punished.

But if the principle is sound, that, when punishment ceases to be corrective, it ceases to be just, then it follows that all hardened and incorrigible transgressors, who are made no better by the punishment inflicted upon them, are unjustly chastised. Men with a seared conscience, and hands dyed in the blood of their race, must run at large, because they are too inveterate to be reformed, and all punishment that does not reform is unjust. A criminal who, at the expiration of his term of confinement, comes forth worse than when he entered the prison, must not be again imprisoned. His punishment has made him rather worse than better; and, if the reasoning of Universalists is sound, it would be unjust to repeat it. Drunkards, too far gone to be reclaimed, should suffer neither at the hands of God nor of man; as such suffering would not reform them, and would therefore be cruel.

No fact is more obvious than that punishment seldom does reform the punished. Men imprisoned for a minor offence, will usually, during the punishment, fit themselves for deeds of bolder daring and deeper depravity. Lads sent to the house of *correction* at fifteen, will, in all probability, be candidates for the state prison at thirty.

ut is all punishment, therefore, cruel and unjust? s no good result from it because the criminal is e more obstinate and rebellious? Who can nate the value of its influence upon the *whole* munity? Who can tell how vast the amount rime, suffering, and death, from which the com- ity is delivered by the prompt and exemplary bution, which those who "are a terror to evil- s" inflict upon offenders? In human govern- ts, criminals are punished for the good of the le community, for the support of government law, for the protection of the innocent, and that and crime may be checked. To a prisoner who plained that it was hard to be hanged for steal- a horse, an English judge rightly explained the ct of the penalty—"You are not hanged for ing a horse; but that horses may not be stolen." ie offender is reclaimed, that is an incidental l. If he is rendered more obstinate, the chief in punishing him is still answered.

) is it in the government of God. The old d was drowned, not to bring them to repent- , but as a punishment for disobeying God. Guilty)m was burned up, not for her own advantage, that the ungodly, in all ages to come, might warning. God scattered the Jews, not to secure iem the things that belonged to their peace, but punishment for not hearing the Savior, when vould have gathered them together. Men are punished under the moral government of God, use they transgress his law. In the sight of *ıtelligent beings,* angels or men, God has estab-

lished the truth that men cannot sin and escape the consequences.

It is not true, then, as Universalists assert, that men are always punished for their own good. It is not true that, when punishment fails to reform the criminal, it is unjust. It is not true that punishment is reformatory in its nature. Therefore, as men may be punished all their lifetime for the good of the community, so, for the same reason, may they be punished throughout an immortal existence.

V. THE WORK OF CHRIST AS A SAVIOR.

He is called "the Savior of all men," "the Savior of the world," and by his death is said to have given "himself a ransom for all." This is presented as a proof of Universalism.

It is worthy of remark how eagerly and promptly all passages in which Christ is called the Savior of the world, and the Savior of all, are applied by Universalists to the future state; while all texts in which salvation is offered on conditions, or is limited to the obedient, are at once discovered to refer only to this life. "He that believeth shall be saved;" "He that endureth to the end shall be saved;" "Are there few that be saved?" "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved;" "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" Offer these and kindred texts to a Universalist, and he informs you *that all* which is asserted in them is very true; but *they have* no reference to a future life: they are ful-

filled in this. And yet, with the same breath, he will urge you to believe that no one will be lost in the future world, because Christ is called the Savior of the world. But if salvation belongs to this life, Christ may be the Savior of all men, and yet no one finally be saved. By what principle of interpretation do the Universalists reach the conclusion, that the *numerous* texts which positively teach that many will not be saved, are limited to *this* life, while the *few* that they select to prove their faith, refer to the future? The same word is used in either case. It has the same signification. If in the one case it is restricted to this world, it must be in the other. But if one refers to eternity, both have their fulfilment there.

Universalists expressly declare that Christ saves men only in this world. "The evils from which Jesus came to save men *are in this world;* and for this reason he came into this world to save them." (*Plain Guide*, 254.)

"*All* those passages of Scripture which define the nature of salvation, agree that Jesus Christ saves man from evil which attaches to him in the *present world.*" (*Expos.* iii. 65.)

To what, then, do those texts cited by Universalists to prove the *final* holiness of all men amount, when the salvation of the gospel relates only to the *present world?*

But, waiving this difficulty, let us pass on to another. Universalists talk of "salvation," of "universal salvation," of "Christ the Savior of the world." What *do they mean by this?* Do they indeed regard

Christ in any just sense as the Savior of the world? They do not allow that men are exposed to any thing hereafter from which Christ does or can save them. They have declared to the world that the death of Christ is not essential to salvation; and though Jesus had not lived, the world would never have perished. On the theory of Universalism, what has Christ done to obtain the title of "Savior"? From what does Jesus save the world? From wrath? No; it assures us that men never were exposed to God's wrath. From sin? Not in *this* life are men saved from sin. It is one of the pillars of the system that men sin till the day of their death, and are *fully punished for all the sins they commit.* Not in the next life does Christ save men from sin; for the system announces that there can be no sin after the resurrection. From deserved punishment? Universalists say that that would be unjust! From death? By no means. All are spiritually dead; and all must die a natural death; and if Universalism be true, there can be no eternal death. From what, then, does Christ save men? From nothing! According to Universalism, what is salvation but a mockery and pretence? How opposite to this are the representations of the Bible! There it is declared that the death of Jesus is the only medium through which God can be just, and justify those who believe in Jesus; that, if Christ had not died, all would have been lost; while Universalism proclaims that man is to be his own savior; or rather is to be saved from nothing at all! Such is the beauty of Universalism. It makes *the mission* and death of Christ a useless exhibition

of cruelty, and all the representations of the Holy Scriptures, based upon the necessity of Christ's mission to the world to save souls, it stamps with deceit.

But suppose it were not so; suppose that men are really exposed to some evil from which Jesus came to give them an opportunity to be saved. What then? The bare fact that Jesus died for all, does not prove that all will actually be saved. The abundance of a blessing is no benefit to those who will not partake of it.

The effects of Christ's atonement can be enjoyed only by faith and obedience. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever *believeth in him* should not perish, but have eternal life." (*John* iii. 14, 15.) There was virtue enough in the serpent to heal all Israel. If any died, it was not for want of abundance of healing power in the remedy, but because the wounded would not *look and live.* So is the Son of man lifted up on the cross and in the preaching of the gospel; in him there is all fulness. But many refuse to believe. They perish, and sink down in endless death. Salvation is offered to man upon conditions; and to invite men to accept the *terms* of salvation, and yet promise to save them whether they accept or not, would be to trifle indeed.

A certain king made a great supper, but said of some, "Not one of them shall taste of my supper;" not for want of sufficient provision, but because they refused to come when invited. The law of Moses was enough to save from idolatry all the people of *Israel. It did not,* because they would not obey. No

abundance of rain will fill the barns of the slothful with plenty. No abundance of light will guide those who close their eyes, stumble, and perish. An abundance of knowledge will not assist those who despise instruction. There was "bread enough and to spare," in the house of the prodigal; but he would have perished with hunger, if he had not arisen, and returned to his father. Though there is balm in Gilead, and physicians there, yet men are not all healed; nor are the ravages of death stayed.

The freeness and sufficiency of the gospel provision remove from men all excuse. If they perish, their blood is on their own heads. Many will perish, not for want of a sufficient supply to meet the necessities of all, but for the reason which inspiration has so graphically set forth in these words—"Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh.—Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me." (*Prov.* i. 25—28.) The gospel is freely offered to all; but men refuse to do the will of God, and perish forever.

VI. THE IMPARTIAL GOODNESS OF GOD.

This is assigned as a reason why all men will be holy and happy in the next state of existence. It is *argued* that God is now good to all; that, in his *dealings* with our race, he makes no distinction, treat-

ıg all with the same favor, and making no difference mong men, either in nature, providence, or grace. nd as his government never changes, he will be thus niversally good forever. But to cast off any in the ıture world, it is said, would change the whole charcter of his government.

This argument assumes as truth what is disproved ›y facts. To prove that God is good to all men, is ın easy affair. But to prove that all men share *equally* in that goodness, is another task. That God has not seen fit to make all men equally happy in this life, must be apparent to any reflecting mind.

Where is the proof of this equality of which Universalists so often speak? Does it appear in nature? The contrary is evident. No man can defend the divine character for goodness, in the works of nature and providence, without admitting a future state, in which the seeming inequalities in this will be removed.

Do nations exhibit this equality? At this moment there is almost as great a diversity in nations, as there will be in the condition of our race in the immortal world. One city is in possession of health; another, equally deserving, is blasted with pestilence, and encompassed with the atmosphere of death. One nation is blessed with plenty, and its garners are full. Another is oppressed with famine; want and suffering abound, the feeble cry for bread, and the strong men are bowed down for want of food. One country has waving over it the olive branch of peace; another is disturbed by the shrill clarion of war; its *fields are drenched* with blood, and rapine and car-

nage revel in all that is lovely and revered. One kingdom is free, and is blessed with civil and religious liberty; another, as worthy, is trodden down in the dust by the iron heel of oppression, and millions are sacrificed to gratify the avarice, the ambition, or the caprice, of a despot. And while a portion of the earth is lighted up by the beams of the gospel, by far the larger part of the world is shrouded in heathen gloom, where the people are the victims of the most appalling vices and the most degrading superstitions.

No one will pretend that this diversity is according to merit. Where, then, I ask, is that equal goodness which promises equal and endless happiness to all our race in the world to come? It does not appear in the dealings of God with the nations of the earth.

But look around you, my friends, and see if this equality, of which Universalists speak, appears in the common walks of life. Is there no difference in the characters of men, in their circumstances and privileges? Do all share equally in wealth, distinction, and happiness? Are all equally exempt from misfortune, affliction, and death? And is the existing diversity according to merit? Do the good always prosper in this life? In order to be successful in this life, to amass wealth, to be honored by the world, to tread the paths of distinction, must men have a character above reproach, and be distinguished for their piety? Do the amiable and the virtuous receive a marked share of the good things and blessings of this life? There can be but one answer given to these questions. The contrary is obviously the fact. Many of the best of our race are subjected to a state of

things in which evil triumphs over good, and grief over joy.

On the other hand, do the wicked always suffer? Are disappointment and sorrow made their portion all their days? Can they be distinguished from others by their troubles? All observation teaches us that it is not so.

We see, then, in this life, — both as respects nations and individuals, either in providence or grace, — that which Universalists assure us cannot exist consistently with the impartial goodness of God. We see the greatest diversity in the characters, privileges, and blessings, of our race. The fact is undeniable. Now, this diversity is consistent with the impartial goodness of God, or it is not. If it is not, then God is not now impartially good; and if not now, he never will be; and so the argument fails at once. But if the character of God, as an impartial Ruler, can be vindicated in view of all the difference there is in the character and enjoyment of our race, then it can be vindicated in the future world, when the wicked shall be separated from the good, and "go away into everlasting punishment." Thus the argument for Universalism is at once refuted. The history of man, in all ages of the world, is a conclusive reply to the assertion that the goodness of God forbids those distinctions which the Bible declares shall exist in the future world.

VII. ARGUMENT FROM THE OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD.

It is said that God is allowed on all hands to be *infinitely wise, powerful*, and good. When he created

man, he made him for endless happiness beyond the grave, or he did not. If he did not, then he was not good. If he did, and yet man fails to secure this result, God is not powerful. Hence it is argued that all men will at last be saved.

But when God made this world, he was as good and as powerful as when he made man. He could have made *this* world a theatre of perfect bliss, or he could not. If he could not, — to adopt the reasoning of Universalists, — then he was not powerful; if he could, and yet would not, then he was not good. Then why is this world a place of pain, affliction, and death? Why is not this a place of undisturbed felicity? Why did not the Almighty make this world all that Universalists assure us heaven will be? Any answer you give refers to the next world. When Adam was placed in the garden of Eden, God could have kept him holy, or he could not. And as he did not interpose, but left him to obey and live, or eat and die, if there is any force in the argument, it proves that in this case God was either not good or not powerful. It is absurd for Universalists to attempt to find relief in the remark that God will overrule this condition of things for final good, and thus, in the end, a greater good be secured than if no evil had existed; for their system forbids such a result. The sin and sorrow, woe and death, in this world, overruled for good! for the good of whom? Not of the sufferer, certainly: he would be much happier in this life without it. All he suffers, every pang *he endures*, is so much abstracted from the positive *felicity of* this world. Neither in the next life can it

be overruled for his good; for Universalism denies the connection between the events of this life and the condition of men in the next. Our present life is to have no effect upon the future. Our conduct here will not affect, in any degree, our happiness hereafter. We are assured that all, from an infant of a day to a sinner of a hundred years, start again upon the same level. How, then, can the sufferings of this life be overruled to eventual good to the sufferer? Or how can our present existence be reconciled at all with goodness and wisdom upon the principles of Universalism?

But will it be said that the misery of some in this world will be overruled to the good of others? to the whole family of man? Admit this, and what becomes of Universalism? Its advocates deny endless punishment, on the ground that men are always punished for their *own good*, and not for the benefit of others. But if the sufferings of one man can be made subservient to the good of others, then one man may suffer hereafter to promote the good of his race; and Universalism is at once swept away. If a man may suffer in this life for the good of others, he may suffer in the next for the same cause. If he can be punished all the days of this life to promote the greatest amount of good of the greatest number, then he may suffer all the days of the next life for the same reason.

Common sense teaches that the goodness of God does not save men from suffering in this world, though God is infinite in power. Will it in the next world? How can you know what God will do, but *from what he has done*? Sin and misery exist here

consistently with divine goodness. They can always so exist; for God and his government never change. Hence Universalism must be false. But if sin and misery cannot exist consistently with goodness, then God is not now good, and Universalism has no support whatever.

The argument, if it has any force, would have prevented the creation of this world as it is. Had it been communicated to Universalists prior to the creation of the earth, that God, wise, powerful, and good, was about to speak a world into existence,—a world in which sin would abound, and pain, disappointment, and sorrow, be the inheritance of all who were to dwell in it,—and that disease and death would triumph over all, would they not have declared such a creation to be at war with the attributes of God? They would have argued that God was too powerful to allow such a creation against his will, and too good to call it into being by his own power. But there has been such a world created, the reasoning of Universalism to the contrary notwithstanding; and we now live in it.

The argument we are discussing, if true, ought to have prevented the drowning of the world. The antediluvians, no doubt, thought God was too good to bring in a flood upon the ungodly, as he would have been, if this sort of reasoning were sound. They might have said that sin was a trivial matter, which did no injury to God; for which men were punished as they passed along; and that God was too merciful *to sweep* them all away with a flood. But did this *reasoning* save them?

So reasoned, most probably, guilty Sodom. "God destroy us by fire from heaven! Does he keep fire there? Will he involve the innocent with the guilty? Did he not make us? Did he not know what we should become before our creation? Would he have given us an existence if we were to be swallowed up in a deluge of fire and brimstone? O, no; he is too good, too powerful, to do so. Such an act would militate against his character." But did Sodom escape?

So might have reasoned the people of Nineveh. "Yet forty days," said the prophet, "and Nineveh shall be overthrown." They might have responded, "What, this great city be destroyed!—a city that contains sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle! Impossible; God is too good to destroy us, though we repent not." But not so reasoned the people of Nineveh. They "believed God," —so records the sacred historian,—and that belief was their salvation. They saw the little cloud in the distance, and knew it to be the harbinger of the coming tempest. They all bowed before God. All, from the king on his throne to the humblest subject in the land, repented, and sought to "turn away the fierce anger of God," lest all should perish together. Their repentance was accepted. "God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way," and he pardoned them. The angry cloud was rolled back. The avenging sword was sheathed. Nineveh was spared.

These examples show us how absurd and false is *the argument pretended* to be drawn from the char-

acter of God. They teach us that, though God is good, he will not clear the guilty; nor will he recede from his threatenings. He will execute them, whether they relate to the overthrow of a world by water, the burning of cities by fire from heaven, or the destruction of the soul in hell.

VIII. RELATION OF MAN TO MAN.

Universalists argue that man is bound to his fellow-man by such close, intimate, and tender ties, that, in view of the future suffering of one, all must feel it; that no one could enjoy heaven with the consciousness that any were cast down to hell. If, therefore, heaven is a happy place, all of the human family will be saved.

This argument, if such it deserves to be called, is a very popular one. I have heard very pathetic appeals made to mothers and friends on the question, Whether they could enjoy heaven, if any that they loved were excluded. Some have gone so far as to say that they should not wish for heaven if all were not to be saved.

Will these men reason thus in regard to the things of this world? Will they refuse wealth, because all are not rich? Will they refuse honor, because it is not conferred on all? If a post of distinction is vacant, or a seat among the high places of the nation is unoccupied, will none of these reasoners enter it, if invited, because all cannot be accommodated, — because a large proportion of all with whom they are acquainted is utterly excluded?

But is it true that a man, in the discharge of his duty, cannot enjoy the rewards of his fidelity, because some one is disobedient, and is punished? Is it true that a man cannot be happy in the discharge of his trust, because some other man has neglected his?

Could not the children of Israel rejoice in their deliverance, because Pharaoh and his hosts were drowned in the Red Sea? Let their shouts of exultation and their notes of triumph give the reply. (*Exod.* xv.)

Can we not enjoy liberty, because the lawless and the unprincipled are confined in prison? Is life no blessing because the murderer or atrocious felon is, by a just sentence, doomed to die? We see on every hand poverty, suffering, and distress. Must our whole life be one of anguish, because others are in sorrow? If a man is industrious, frugal, and temperate, can he have no enjoyment from this source, because others are indolent, profuse, and intemperate?

The argument would make God unjust. The good could have no advantage over the evil. He that served God and he that served him not would be put on the same level. However diligently a large proportion of the human race might seek a blessing from God by fearing him and working righteousness, their happiness would be destroyed, if one or two should refuse to obey God; for this argument contends that a man cannot be happy in obedience and holiness until every other creature shall be obedient and holy.

But how clearly do common experience and com-

mon sense refute this argument! We all know that life is a blessing, though many die by the law of the land. The comforts of industry can be enjoyed, though the indolent may suffer. The temperate man can bring a blessing to his hearth-stone, and rejoice in it, though the inebriate is cursed, and his children cry for bread. Liberty is sweet, though the lawless are deprived of the boon. The good man can be satisfied from himself. And our Creator has so constituted our race, that they can love life, see good days, and be blessed, though bondage, misery, and death, extensively prevail. So will it be in the eternal state. This the Savior has taught in the history of the rich man and Lazarus. There the Savior has shown that, in full view of the anguish of the rich man, Lazarus was not disturbed, nor his felicity destroyed. He had a perfect knowledge of God's justice; he knew and felt that the suffering of the rich man was right. So will all the redeemed have a perfect knowledge of the magnitude of sin, the amount of punishment it merits, and the righteousness of God in sending away into everlasting punishment all "who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son." The fact that many perish forever, will no more disturb the bliss of heaven, than the peace of all good men is forever fled, because a felon or murderer is sentenced to die. We see, then, the argument assumes as truth what all experience denies. Men who obey God can be happy in both worlds, though many refuse to obey, and so perish *forever.*

IX. THIS LIFE A STATE OF PERFECT RETRIBUTION.

All men, it is said, are here rewarded according to their deeds. Therefore they can neither deserve nor receive punishment in the future world.

The idea that this life is a state of perfect retribution, and that all the results of human action are bounded by time, is at once monstrous and destructive. To all reflecting minds it is apparent that there is not a perfect apportionment of suffering and happiness according to merit in this world. A just distribution of rewards and punishments does not here take place. The contrary assertion is refuted by the slightest glance at the actual state of things. "If the experience of the present life is to have no effect hereafter, —if all are to start again upon the same level, however they may have lived here, — why live here at all? Why the pains, the sufferings, and distresses, incident to the present constitution of our being? Why live, and go through all the various pains and perils from birth to death, if no purpose is answered?

If it be a true doctrine, that, whatever our condition and conduct may be in this world, — however we may live or die, — we shall be equally and infinitely happy hereafter, then suicide becomes a virtue. Once convinced that death puts an end to all his woes, a final period to all his sufferings, and the only consistent act of man would be — to avoid his coming troubles, and the blighting of his earthly plans — to cut the slender thread of life, and step at once into endless felicity. This is as natural as for the weary traveller to seek

his couch, or the laboring man to rest from his toils. That this idea does lead toward suicide, I shall show when I come to speak of the practical tendencies of Universalism.

The doctrine that all sin is adequately punished in this life, denies the divine justice, and leads to conclusions of a most appalling character. On this theory it must be admitted that all suffering results from sin, and all prosperity is the fruit of virtue. It follows that all the poor, the diseased, and the unfortunate, among whom are some of the brightest ornaments of virtue and religion, are the most wicked and hateful in the sight of God, and that this is the explanation of their great sufferings. Moreover, all the rich and exalted must be the favorites of Heaven. No matter how they obtained their wealth and distinction, — no matter what their characters are, or whom they have ruined, or what their past life has been, — their prosperity must needs be proof that their conduct is well pleasing to God; for it has drawn down upon them peculiar marks of the divine favor.

If, as Universalists contend, sin brings its own punishment, how comes it that the *more* a man sins, the *less* he is punished? Every one knows that the purer the heart, the more powerful is the conscience. The humble Christian suffers more in his mind from the neglect of secret prayer a single day, than does a hardened pirate while bathing his hands in the blood of his race. If remorse of conscience were all the punishment which God intended for the sinner, then *all the* additional pain inflicted by parents, teachers, *and magistrates*, by the rod, the prison, and the gal-

lows, must be unjustifiable treatment of the transgressor, already sufficiently chastised for his faults by the lash of conscience. The villain who escapes the legal punishment of his crimes, so far from escaping justice, escapes injustice.

Reason as you will about the evil results of sin to the sinner in this life; paint his character as black and gloomy as you may; beset his path with thorns; make sorrow his portion; prove that, like the troubled and tempestuous ocean, he has no rest; affirm that conscience, like a gnawing worm, allows him no peace; and after you have exhausted your eloquence, one fact meets you every where, overthrows all your reasoning, and proves, if God be just, that this life cannot be a state of perfect and final retribution. The fact is simply this; *here* the innocent suffer *with* the guilty, and often *more* than the guilty.

Who is harmed the most, the incendiary who lifts the torch, fires a village, and gets off with his plunder; or those who, at midnight, escaping barely with their lives, are by him turned houseless and penniless upon the cold charity of the world? Who suffers the keenest anguish, the drunkard, who half the time is rioting in his madness, and the other half is senseless, nearly, as a stone; or his needy family, his half-fed, half-clothed, ignorant, and debased children, his heart-broken, abused, and suffering wife? Who has the most sorrow, that reckless young man, maddened by the wine-cup, and wild with licentious passions and debasing pleasures; or those fond, but disappointed parents, who nurtured him with tenderness, watched over him with solicitous care, and hoped in old age to lean upon him for support,

but who find their prop already broken, and whose gray hairs are descending with sorrow to the tomb? Does not the libertine suffer less from his unhallowed career than do his wretched victims? He revels in sin, boasts of his successes, and in old age looks back with fiendish exultation upon his pathway, strown with the spoils of virtue, and recounts the numbers which have fallen by his arts. While he glories in his crimes, who can estimate the bleeding hearts, the blasted reputations, the parental wretchedness, the desolated homes, the shame, the anguish, the despair, and the untimely deaths, he has caused?

Reason, speculate as you will upon this subject, stern facts teach you that the retributions of this life are usually such, that innocence and purity, for the present, suffer the most. And if there is no other world in which a just retribution takes place, and these inequalities are requited, then God is not just; and man is a monument, not of the justice and righteousness of God, but of partial and inequitable dealing.

It is in vain to argue that men must be punished in the same state in which they commit the sin; for we know that such is not the case. The results of crime are not "confined to the *place* where the act was committed. Sin, in youth, may lay the foundation of a disease that shall complete its work on the other side of the globe. An early career of dissipation in America may fix in the frame the elements of a disorder, that shall complete its work in the splendid *capital of* the French, or, it may be, in the sands of *the equator*, or the snows of Siberia." Men are sel-

dom punished on the spot in which the crime is perpetrated, but in the place appointed by the government against whose laws the offence is committed. God's government extends over heaven, earth, and hell. In any part of his dominions he could have set his throne of judgment. He has announced that "the ungodly are *reserved* unto the day of judgment to be punished;" and that, in the judgment of the great day, men will be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body.

I have thus reviewed the principal arguments upon which Universalism rests. I have also presented to you the reasons which prove these arguments to be unsound. Should we consider the system without reference to its alarming moral tendency, and regard it simply as a system to be received or rejected, as the arguments advanced in its favor did or did not support it, we should find an unprejudiced public rendering the verdict, "Thou art weighed, and art found wanting."

It must, I think, be apparent to all, that Universalism deserves no consideration as a religious system. Its claims are founded in sophistry and assumption, and supported by the most violent wresting and palpable perversion of the word of God. It is a delusion of the most fatal kind, and destructive of the choicest good of man. All who trust in it fatally injure their own souls. The claims of Universalism are unfounded. It claims to be of God, and yet preaches as did the serpent in Eden. It claims to be the gospel of Christ, and yet was not known till nearly *eighteen hundred* years after the ascension of the

Savior. It claims to be *the* doctrine of the Bible, and yet contradicts the whole tenor of its teaching, makes the threatenings of the Bible a mockery, the mission and death of Jesus a pretence, and proves the inspired penmen to be incompetent or dishonest. It claims to seek the good of man, and yet, so far from turning the transgressor from the error of his way, it "strengthens the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way and live;" assuring men that without holiness they will see the Lord, and that, however they may live or die, none will be excluded from heaven.

But let us not be deceived. The Bible teaches that the unholy, the vile, the unbelieving, will be punished with eternal exclusion from the presence of God; that the holy, the pure, and the believing, only, can hope for eternal salvation; that all who reject Christ, shall not see life, but perish. Can you, then, trust the delusions of Universalism? Can you cling to a system having such tendencies and such feeble proofs? Can you build your hopes of eternal happiness upon a foundation so sandy, so certain to fail when most it is needed, and to give way when too late to repair or rebuild?

If you have no confidence in the system, give it no place, no, not an hour; but say every where, to all persons, on all occasions,—say it kindly, but firmly,—that you regard Universalism to be what it is,—an awful delusion, a destructive error, fatal to man in both worlds. Be induced by no consideration to countenance its ministry, or mingle with those who sit in the seats of the scorner.

But if it already has got hold of you, let me entreat you calmly and prayerfully to review the ground on which you rest, the evidence of your faith, and your preparation to meet your God. If this life is a life of probation, — if these powers and privileges are given to prepare us for another life, — then you are awfully wrong. Your mistake is of a most fearful magnitude. Eternity is not long enough to enable you to correct the wrong. Many, very many, are reviewing this subject. Many of your number are escaping from the dreadful delusion that long has bound them. O, be not deceived! Let not the enemy of souls secure you for his dark dominions! Fly, this hour, to the Rock of Ages! Fly from error to truth, from sin to holiness, from death to life! "If thou art wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself; but if thou scornest, thou alone must bear it."

LECTURE VI.

REASONS FOR RENOUNCING UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM ITS MORAL RESULTS.

MATT. vii. 16.

YE SHALL KNOW THEM BY THEIR FRUITS.

THE Savior clearly foresaw that, after his death, men would arise, who would assume his name, and profess to love his truth, while they would bear in their hearts the same hatred to Christians that wolves bear to sheep. The chief danger from their hatred would result from their being disguised. Were they to appear as the enemies of truth, and openly assail it, little harm would attend their opposition. But Satan often "transforms himself into an angel of light;" and his servants often transform "themselves into ministers of righteousness."

How, then, shall they be distinguished from the servants of God? Not by their appearance, nor by their claims; for they seem to be, and claim to be, what they are not. Not by their appeals to the Bible. Satan did this in the temptation of our Lord; and his ministers have also done it in all ages of the church.

The Son of God knew that such a state of things *would* exist; and that, without great watchfu

and care, none would escape its dangers. That the sincere followers of the Savior might know the servant of their Master from such as came to destroy, he gave them a decisive test in the text, "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Wherever the grape and the fig are found growing, there may be found, also, the vine and the fig-tree. By this, Christ Jesus meant to teach that his religion is distinguished by peculiar results, which will always attend it; and where these are wanting, there his doctrine does not exist. The text is a simple, yet positive test, given for all ages and all climes. I shall apply it to Universalism, and offer, as the subject of this lecture, the following proposition: —

UNIVERSALISM DOES NOT PRODUCE THE FRUIT THAT ATTENDED THE PREACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES: ON THE CONTRARY, ITS MORAL RESULTS ARE SUCH AS COULD NOT ATTEND A SYSTEM HAVING GOD FOR ITS AUTHOR.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

No one can have a just view of the practical tendency of Universalism, or be prepared candidly to weigh its claims, unless he is made familiar with the doctrines which distinguish it at this day. I say at *this* day, for it has never been the same thing in any two considerable periods of time. Mr. Murray is called "the father of Universalism." But not one doctrine which he defended enters into the composition of *the present* system. He differed from

evangelical community but in one thing. The advocates of the present system differ in every thing. If Mr. Murray were now alive, he would have no more sympathy with Universalism than with atheism. He would wholly renounce his reputed child. Though they boast of Mr. Murray as their father, Universalists cannot regard him as a preacher of truth; for they reject all the doctrines which he taught. They admit that he was not competent to expound the Bible, for they do not respect any interpretation or opinion which he advanced.

The Universalism of the present day denies the native depravity of man, the supreme divinity of our Lord, the vicarious atonement of Christ, and the free moral agency of man. It teaches that this life is not a probationary existence, that the consequences of human actions are all limited by it, and that the future life will be in no way affected by the conduct of men in this. It teaches that the Sabbath is an institution of expediency, and not of divine appointment; that oral prayer is not a duty; that sin is not an evil in the government or sight of God; that there is no such place as hell; and that the devil is either "a figure of speech," "a Sabean freebooter," "a disease," or, at most, "an evil principle" in man. It also teaches that the soul of man is not immortal, and that there is no retribution in the future world for our conduct in this; but that all start again upon the same level, whatever their characters may have been in this world.

Such, in miniature, is that system which claims *to be the* religion of the cross—the religion to defend

which Christ came, suffered, and died. Were it my purpose to show what the tendency of Universalism must be from the nature of its peculiar doctrines, I should have no occasion to travel beyond the summary just introduced. Such doctrines must be baleful in their tendency; they must be, from their very nature, positively licentious. The spread of them cannot but be destructive to human peace and morals in this life, and to the soul in the life to come.

The Universalism of this day can date back no farther than 1818. This is the precise age of modern Universalism. The man yet lives who moulded the present system. And already has he begun to reap some of the bitter fruits of his labor.

It is not denied that some Universalist preachers of the present day profess to *believe* in limited future punishment; but they do not *preach* it. They hold their places because they are silent upon that topic. Thus they throw their influence against it; for, while they maintain silence, the advocate of ultra-Universalism makes his faith the burden of every sermon. In some cases, I have known a special contract to be made with a believer in future punishment, when about to settle. The society agree to give the preacher no trouble because he believes in future retribution, and the preacher is not to trouble the society by maintaining it. Such a contract was made by my predecessor in Salem. Mr. Balfour says, "I have been among Universalists over twenty years. I have never heard it [future punishment] preached but once, and the preacher *hardly* said enough about it to let his *hearers understand* that he believed this doctrine." (*Christ. Mess.* July 17, 1841.)

In speaking of the moral results of Universalism, I shall look at it as it touches the great interests of man, show what it has done and is doing for our race, and set forth its influence upon the best good of the human family. It has been, in some form, in the world fifty years—long enough for seed-time and harvest. It has been weighed in the balance, and found wanting; or it has not. What it is now peculiar for, it ever will be. In what it now lacks, it must ever be deficient.

The advocates of Universalism claim for it a benevolence and a philanthropy not found in any other system. They assure the benevolent that it has strong claims upon them, as it seeks and advances all that affects well the human race. They assure the world that it breathes good-will to all men, and secures all the good that can be found in any other faith, without the evils which attend them.

Whatever it may be worth in a practical point of view will appear in its history and progress. It has little to do with eternity; and nothing with preparing for it. It can, therefore, have no excuse for not attending to this world. If it is fit to live by, we shall know it when we see its practical influence. If it has a good moral and benevolent tendency, it will take the lead in all the benevolent enterprises of the day. Nay, all of them will originate with it. The advocates of it will be found spending their strength, and employing the means of the denomination, in carrying onward every good work, and ameliorating the condition of man.

On this subject I speak what I know. With Universalism I have had a long and a familiar acquaintance.

My childhood was passed under its influence. Twelve years of the best part of my life have been devoted to its defence. I have seen its results in the conduct it promotes; in the religion it enforces; and in its effect upon the bereaved, the sick, and the dying. What I say is the fruit of my own experience, observation, and knowledge. I hold myself responsible for the statements I make, and the facts which I present. I shall speak of Universalism as it is; of its moral tendency and practical results. I come as a traveller, from a land to which you are invited, to tell you of its clime, its soil, its inhabitants; and offer to you some advice in respect to a settlement there. I shall be assisted by those who still dwell in the land. Startling as some of the facts which will appear in this lecture may seem, I think it will be seen that not one is asserted that cannot be sustained by the testimony of many of the prominent advocates of Universalism. I have read much and heard much of the moral tendency of Universalism; but all this has not weighed a feather in my mind, in comparison with what I have seen of the practical influence of that deadly delusion.

The proposition presented as the subject of this lecture has a twofold character. It is negative and positive. It asserts what the system is not, and what it is; what it does not do, and what it is peculiar for doing. I will first present the negative part of the subject.

UNIVERSALISM DOES NOT PRODUCE THE FRUIT THAT ATTENDED THE PREACHING OF CHRIST AND THE *APOSTLES.*

The preaching of the Savior and the apostles was distinguished for three results. Wherever they preached, these fruits were found:—

1. Their preaching ALARMED men. The great end to be gained by preaching the truth, was to reprove or convince of sin and of judgment, that men might seek to be saved. The Savior's teaching always pointed out the sinfulness and danger of men. Those who heard the truth, and believed, were convicted, and pricked in their heart.

You may see this result, on an extensive scale, on the day of Pentecost. Thousands heard, and were alarmed. One sensation pervaded their souls; one expression gave utterance to the feelings of all. It was the expression of alarm—"Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

To take a single instance. The jailer at midnight heard of Jesus. Alarm took hold of him. He uttered almost the same sentiment heard at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost—"Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"

When Jesus preached, whole congregations were often filled with wrath. As Paul, eloquent and mighty in the Scripture, stood before Felix, reasoning "of judgment to come," that impious ruler trembled before his prisoner. We are assured by the apostle that "knowing the terror of the Lord," in that all are to "stand before the judgment-seat of Christ," he "persuaded men," and ceased not to warn them day and night with tears.

2. It REFORMED men. It did more than startle the conscience. It reformed the man, changed his habits

and his life. To this moral change, produced by their preaching, the apostles ever confidently appealed, to prove that their religion was from God, and that they were its divinely-appointed teachers.

By it the Romans had been turned from "being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, maliciousness," and from being "haters of God," to a course of life so opposite, that their "faith was spoken of throughout the whole world."

To the Corinthians Paul writes, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 *Cor.* vi. 9—11.)

History informs us that Corinth, at the time this Epistle was written, was one of the most corrupt and licentious cities on the earth. Its very religion tended to and encouraged impurity and sin. But into this corrupt place, Paul introduced the gospel of his Master. He lifted up the cross, and commanded and saw a change—an immediate change—in the character of those who received his word. He could appeal to them to remember what they had been, and what they were, through the Spirit of God. Out of that polluted class of men whose crimes he enumerates, the apostle was able to exhibit in their reformation, before a gainsaying world, the truth, that the religion of

which he was the minister could change the characters of men. He set them up as trophies of the renewing grace of God, as monuments of the transforming power of the gospel.

The Galatians, before their conversion, "fulfilled the lusts of the flesh." But when they "put on Christ," they "crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts," and brought forth in their lives "the fruits of the Spirit." The Ephesians had been "dead in trespasses and sins," walking "according to the course of this world," in "all unrighteousness and uncleanness," "being disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate." But the word was preached unto them; it turned them from the way of death, and in their lives and conversations they glorified God. And so was it in every place where the gospel was preached. Its triumph was seen in the reformation and purity of those who felt its power.

3. It did more than alarm the sinner and change the outward man. It touched and *changed the heart.* It went down to the deep foundations of the soul, and wrought there a thorough change. It attuned the heart to the service and the praise of God. It took off the affections from low and sordid things, and placed them on God. It rendered the heart to God, that he might reign supreme in that spot, so long the strong-hold of the adversary of God and man. It not only hushed the blasphemous ravings of the impious, but it caused them to bend in prayer. It not only made men moral; it made them also devout. It not only broke in upon the practice of sin; it took away the love of it. It converted men; made them

men of prayer, and caused them to be as much distinguished for their habits of devotion, as they before had been for recklessness and impiety.

Such results ever attended the preaching of the Savior, and of his chosen and divinely-inspired servants. In no age, since the time of the Savior, has his truth been preached, when these results have not followed. They as much distinguish divine truth at this day, as they did eighteen centuries ago. But Universalism is not attended with them. They are not expected; and in many cases, I presume, they are not desired.

1. Does the preaching of Universalism *alarm* men? When it is for the first time preached in a place, do men begin to tremble on account of sin? Do they cry out, "What must I do to be saved?" Do men begin to think of death, of judgment, and eternity, when they learn that all men will be saved? Alarm men? alarm them with what? With its siren song, its assurance of safety, its reiterated assertion that all will be well at death? Absurd. Its great business is to allay fear. It comes to men recommending itself as a system designed to remove all occasions of fear. It teaches that, while some systems present future woe, and alarm the ungodly in prospect of being lost, this comes to say, "Be not alarmed; there is no eternal judgment; you cannot be lost; God will save all men; take your ease, eat, drink, and be merry." No preacher of this scheme of delusion has the question put to him by an aroused and startled conscience, "What must I do to be saved?"

2. Does *the preaching* of Universalism reform men? *Twelve years in its* ministry have not brought one

instance of reformation from that cause under my observation. I have never heard of an instance, nor have I ever seen a man who had been more favored than myself in this respect. I have heard it stoutly asserted that men were made better by the preaching of Universalism; but in the oldest settlements of the faith, when the individuals thus reformed were sought for, they could never be found.

I have known moral men to embrace Universalism, and continue moral. I have known them to embrace it, and become immoral. I have known bad men to embrace it, and continue as bad as ever. But never, in a single instance, have I known a bad man to be reformed by attending the preaching of Universalism. Nor do I believe that the united labors of all the advocates of Universalism, under any of its forms, for the past fifty years, have produced ten cases of reformation, if they have so much as one.

So far from reforming men, it is the fact that almost all persons excommunicated from evangelical churches fly to Universalism for shelter. It is the boast of Universalists that most of their preachers come from other denominations. It will take away much of the occasion of boasting, when it is known that almost all of these men have been excommunicated from evangelical churches. I have before me a certificate of the excommunication of an individual from a Christian church in Boston, for an offence which it would be improper to name. Immediately upon his excommunication, he embraced Universalism; and in less than a year from the day when he was cut off from the church for immorality, he was an accredited minister of Universalism.

You hear much of the spread of Universalism. Is its prosperity indicated by a reformation in character and morals? Does profaneness cease at its approach? Do persons once distinguished for their licentiousness, become patterns of purity as soon as they believe that all men will be saved? Do Sabbath-breakers learn to hallow the Sabbath? Do seriousness, solemn attention to religion, and the habitual and devout reading of the Bible, mark the diffusion of this sentiment? Or is the opposite the fruit of Universalism? All can answer, as far as their observation goes. And but one answer will be returned.

Who rises up, and says, "Once I was an unbeliever in Universalism. Then I was profane, and all my words were mixed with blasphemy. By accident I heard the doctrine of Universalism, and learned that, in the future world, God will hold them guiltless who took his name in vain, and that all blasphemies, none excepted, will be forgiven unto men. I turned at once from my evil way; and from the hour that I heard and believed, I have feared an oath." Who says, "Once I was a drunkard; I was a degraded being, a burden to myself, a curse to my friends. But I embraced Universalism. I learned that the drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God, and that, though I were to die in my sin, I should not be excluded from the favor of God. When convinced of this, I dashed the poison from my lips. I have since been a sober man." I again remark, you hear much of the spread of Universalism. Are its trophies and the fruits of its triumphs such as these?

It is sometimes said by Universalists, in extenuation

of this state of things, that they have not time to attend to moral culture. They are so much opposed, they tell you,—so many things are said against them,—they are so constantly required to defend their faith,—that they have little time to attend to moral truths. But have they as hard a warfare as Paul? He was scourged, stoned, imprisoned, and persecuted, in every city. Yet he had time to speak to the consciences of men, and reform the guilty. That a conversion to Universalism begets a hatred of Orthodoxy, is true. But that it creates a hatred of sin, and a love for holiness, does not appear. Whatever its progress may be, it exerts no reforming power.

3. Does it *convert* men, and lead to habits of devotion? In almost all congregations you may find some persons who secretly or openly trust in Universalism. Let such persons be converted, and at once they abhor Universalism. Let a man who once professed to be converted, fall away; and just so far as he forsakes his profession, will he turn to Universalism. A man, in any evangelical congregation, who is converted to God, will find no occasion to leave the congregation with which he has worshipped to find spiritual food. He will love the place better, feel a livelier interest in the truth which now he can understand, and enjoy and prefer the office of a door-keeper in the house of God, to the highest seat in the tents of sin. A man converted in a Universalist congregation, leaves the place at once. He feels that he is in a deadly atmosphere; and the man surrounded by fatal contagion, flies not more swiftly to breathe the healthy *mountain* air, than flies a ransomed soul from the

ministry of Universalism. In this the experience of all Christians unites. No converted man can dwell satisfied with Universalism. It cannot, therefore, convert the soul. Its every tendency proves it to be that delusion, which with "lies makes the heart of the righteous sad, and strengthens the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." (*Ezek.* xiii. 22.)

It is not a system of prayer. No man embraces it because he has become a man of prayer, or a devout student of the Bible. Any religious man, who feels the slightest inclination towards Universalism, will own, if he is an honest man, that this inclination began when he allowed himself to neglect secret prayer, and the duties of a Christian life.

It does not tend to a serious and prayerful reading of the Bible. Many read it to find proof-texts for their opinions. But most of them settle down into the belief that no one will finally be lost. What salvation is, of what the bliss of heaven is to consist, or how they can be happy to spend an eternity in employments they so perfectly detest in this world, few seem to know, or care at all.

No minister of the sect whom I ever knew, maintains family prayer. I have known many to ridicule the custom; but no one to observe it. I have been often in the families of the principal advocates of Universalism, and passed the night. They have been at my house. I found no family devotions at their dwellings. They expressed no surprise at not finding an altar at my fireside. That Universalist preachers *would pray in a family* if asked to do so, is most

probable. Of this, of course, I do not speak. But the custom of regular, family prayer is not to be found in any preacher's family with which I ever had any acquaintance. I knew one man who asked a blessing at his table. But he did this only when he had company; and was led to the practice by the remark of a friend, who told him he thought it looked strange for a minister to have no blessing craved at his table.

So far as my own custom was concerned, I neither read the Bible in my family, nor prayed with them. I did not feel it my duty to do so. I should as soon have thought it my duty to turn my parlor into a Mahometan mosque, and gather my family together to see me perform those ablutions which the religion of Mahomet requires, as to have engaged with them in family worship. Nor is this a hard saying. The sect do not consider this thing as a blemish. They are proud of it. They affect to pity the poor, blinded, superstitious men, who are chained to the family altar.

I have known some clergymen and some laymen to leave evangelical denominations, and join the Universalists. But I have observed it as a fact invariably occurring, that no sooner is this done, and the convert firmly settled in his new faith, than he abandons his habits of family prayer. A person of my acquaintance once said to me, after his conversion to Universalism, "I wonder that the Universalist clergy do not pray in their families, if it were only to stop the mouths of the Orthodox." He set up family prayer for this purpose; but the flame soon went out upon his altar. *He gave* up his devotions, and ceased to wonder that *his new* brethren did not pray, even though it might

have accomplished the great results anticipated in stopping the mouths of the Orthodox. Indeed, a tropical plant could sooner bloom in Nova Zembla, than a praying man continue such, when identified with Universalism.

Why must it not be so? Universalists do not allow that family prayer is a duty. They do not admit that any prayer is necessary. Their theory is, that God will do as much unasked, as he will when men supplicate favors by prayer. In no case do they allow that prayer changes or affects the dealings of God. I once heard a sermon from the father of modern Universalism, [H. Ballou,] designed to prove that so much prayer as the Orthodox indulged in was not commendable. It was an impeachment of the divine goodness to suppose that it would withhold favors from men simply because they refused to ask for them. He argued that this ceaseless importunity, so far from being pleasing to God, must be offensive. To sustain this point, the preacher remarked that a father who had promised a favor to his child, would be displeased if that child should, night and morning, — indeed, every moment that he was in the presence of his parent, — be asking for the promised favor. It was thought that, so far from speedily conferring the favor, the parent would most probably withhold it altogether.

With such views of the subject, is it at all strange that they do not have family or social prayer? Is it strange that this service in public is felt as a burden which they would gladly lay down? Is it singular that *some preachers* have already abandoned public *prayer? or that they* can point to others who con-

tinue the practice, not from principle, but because "the community are not sufficiently enlightened to allow them to lay aside the practice"?

When I resided in Hartford, Connecticut, the editor of the Universalist paper in that city announced, through its columns, that, for the future, he should refuse to pray in public when he conducted public service. He contended that such prayer was wrong; that he had conversed with a large number of Universalist preachers, who agreed with him in theory, but thought the public not yet enlightened enough to dispense with it; and that offering prayer in connection with a sermon, was a tribute to Orthodoxy that he was not willing to pay. He offered a reward of one thousand dollars to any man who would prove that the Savior ever made a public prayer.

The manner of this individual was, to begin his service by singing; he then read his discourse; after which, in the room of the customary benediction, he would announce to the congregation that the exercises were closed, by taking his hat and walking out of the pulpit.

Nor did this preacher stand alone. Mr. Grosh, the editor of one of the most widely-circulated Universalist journals in the country, undertook to defend this course. Some persons, and myself among the number, opposed the abandonment of public prayer. Mr. Grosh calls this "bigotry and persecution." And, giving utterance to his views, he says, "While I agree with him, that they [public prayers] are not com*manded*, I do not believe that they are altogether for*bidden*. On the whole, however, I do not believe

there is much difference of opinion between br. R. S. and myself, or between him and other brethren." Mr. Grosh adds, "I was once conscientiously opposed to all public vocal prayers. I preached several months without them." (*Mag. and Adv.* vol. iv. 334.)

Again Mr. Grosh says, "It is true, as a denomination, we have not even family prayers *statedly* performed. As to prayer meetings, I never heard of but one instance where they were regularly held for any period of time, and but a few instances where they were held occasionally. To the charge implied in the above question, [Why have not Universalists prayer meetings? &c.] I am therefore prepared, on the part of Universalists, to plead guilty, if guilt there be in it." (*Mag. and Adv.* iv. 245.)

When these things are urged against their system, Universalists reply that the same things were urged against the Savior. He was said to be irreligious, blasphemous, intemperate, and the friend of sinners. Therefore it is said that the preaching of the Savior and the preaching of Universalists must be the same.

There is some difference, we apprehend, in the instances said to be parallel. The enemies of Christ sought his ruin. They could find no fault in him. To condemn him, they must invent charges. All their accusations were false. They fabricated the worst things that could possibly be said, and which, if true, would have proved that the Son of God was all that his enemies declared him to be. They were not true; and Christ was innocent. That the same

charges are preferred against Universalism is probable. The system, as to its moral tendency, is accused of doing all that the enemies of Christ laid to his charge. But there is this difference: In regard to the Savior, the accusation was utterly false; but in regard to Universalism, it is most strictly true.

We have seen what the religion of the Bible does, when it enters the heart. It takes impious, ungodly, prayerless men, changes their whole character, and makes them prayerful and devout. But Universalism, so far from making such a change in the reckless and irreligious, takes men whose habits of devotion are already formed, breaks them up, cuts loose all restraints, and, as far as its influence is felt, assists men to "cast off fear and restrain prayer."

I now ask, "Was not the Savior habitually devout? Is there any feature of his character more prominent than this?" He began, continued, and ended, his ministry with prayer. So was it with the apostles. Every act was sanctified by the word of God and prayer. All the holy men of God have been noted for their spirit of prayer and supplication.

If the gospel alarmed, reformed, and converted men,—if it led to religious conduct and devotion,—then a system so opposite in its effects as Universalism, cannot be the gospel. If it is, then is there no truth in the text. Men *can* gather grapes of thorns, and figs of thistles; and there is no such thing as knowing them by their fruits. But, if the test contained in the text be certainly true, it follows that *Universalism* is a gross and fatal delusion.

I shall now present the positive part of my main proposition: —

THE MORAL RESULTS OF UNIVERSALISM ARE SUCH AS COULD NOT ATTEND A SYSTEM OF WHICH GOD IS THE AUTHOR; FOR ITS TENDENCY IS DOWNWARD, AND ALWAYS DOWNWARD, BOTH IN DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

I. UNIVERSALISM IS DOWNWARD IN DOCTRINE.

When Universalism was first introduced into this country, its advocates denied but one article of the Orthodox creed. They rejected simply the *eternity* of punishment. Mr. Murray is styled the "father of American Universalism." (*Mod. Hist. of Univ.* p. 318.) He came to this country from England, and landed in the month of September, 1770. Though a believer in the doctrine of Universalism, he disguised his sentiments for nearly *three years*. During this time, he preached as an Orthodox man in various parts of the country. With the Congregationalists, he passed as one of their number. When with the Presbyterians, or the Baptists, or the Methodists, he was supposed to belong to the sect in whose society he happened to be.

The disguise was first stripped from him in Upper Freehold, New Jersey, by Rev. Mr. Tennant. Mr. Murray was thrown off his guard, and a complete knowledge of his principles obtained. He soon became an open advocate of Universalism, and then found his true level. Mr. Murray, in his autobiography, made loud complaint that his confidence was betrayed when his real sentiments were made known. For proof of

these facts, consult "Life of Murray," pages 195, 206, 209, 241, and 244.

But Mr. Murray was a Calvinist, with this exception, that he believed that all were elected to endless life. He believed in the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ, in original sin, in regeneration, and in endless punishment. He believed that the curse of the law was endless death; that all men were justly exposed to it; and that from this Christ came to redeem men. He believed salvation to be deliverance from deserved punishment.

First Downward Step.

Before the death of Mr. Murray, Mr. Ballou, now of Boston, denied the divinity of the Savior and the atonement. To give his own words: "I had preached but a short time before my mind was entirely freed from all the perplexities of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the common notion of atonement. As fast as those old doctrines were by any means rendered the subjects of inquiry, they were exploded." (*Mod. Hist.* p. 437.)

The denial of the divinity of Jesus Christ, Mr. Murray regarded as a denial of the Christian faith. Never, from the hour that Mr. Ballou's opinions were known till the day of Mr. Murray's death, did he regard Mr. Ballou as a Christian. He would not associate with him, nor allow him to preach in his desk. After Mr. Murray's death, the committee of his society in Boston engaged Mr. Ballou to preach for them a few Sabbaths. Before his first sermon was closed, difficulty arose. Mrs. Murray announced to the con-

gregation that the sentiments advanced by Mr. Ballou were not those which her husband had preached to them. The society would not allow him to proceed. They said he was not a Christian, but was preaching deism in disguise. They would not allow him to complete his engagement; and he was obliged to retire.

Mr. Mitchell, of New York, had similar views of modern Universalism. He died a few years ago, and was the last of the Murray school of preachers. When Mr. Sawyer removed to New York, he called upon Mr. Mitchell as a brother in the faith, and wished his countenance and coöperation in building up Universalism in that city. Mr. Mitchell replied, in direct terms, that he did not look upon Mr. Sawyer as a Christian, but as one whose system, at best, was refined deism; and that Mr. Sawyer, and those whom he represented, must expect from him only the most uncompromising hostility.

It is worthy of notice here, that Mr. Mitchell died in a house in which a Universalist preacher boarded. Mr. Mitchell would receive no religious attentions from his hands, on the ground that he was not a Christian minister. And yet you will find Universalists claiming Mr. Mitchell as a preacher of their order.

Universalists complain of the Christian community for not allowing them the name of Christians, nor owning their preachers as ministers of the gospel. But why complain? Evangelical Christians do no more in this respect than the father and founder of Universalism did before his death; and the sect was not so degenerate then as now. If they had degenerated so much before the death of the father of the

system that he would not own them, have they just ground to complain that others entertain the same opinion of them and their system, and treat them accordingly, now that they are even more degenerate?

After the death of Mr. Murray and the generation to which he preached, the downward tendency was further seen in the universal rejection of the divinity of the Savior.

Second Downward Step.

Until the year 1818, the sect generally admitted the doctrine of future punishment. About the time mentioned, Mr. Ballou announced the theory, that "the Scriptures begin and end the history of sin in flesh and blood; and that, beyond this mortal existence, the Bible teaches no other sentient state, but that which is called by the blessed name of life and immortality." (*Mod. Hist.* pp. 437, 438.)

To this sentiment, for some time, much opposition was made. Mr. Ballou was editor of the principal Universalist journal at the period when he denied future punishment. For a season, he admitted into his paper articles in defence of future retribution. But when arguments were urged against his theory which he could not answer, Mr. Ballou closed his paper against the Restorationists; and while he continued to attack the doctrine of future punishment, the believers in that sentiment were excluded from making any reply. Great dissatisfaction arose among those who felt themselves aggrieved. On several occasions, a separation from the body of Universalists was threat-

ened. It took place in 1828; when the believers in the salvation of all men were organized into two denominations. The one, called "Restorationists," embraced the believers in future punishment. The other, called "Universalists," embraced those who confine all the consequences of sin to this world. Though formerly the term "Universalist" was applied to all believers in universal salvation, it now refers to those only who reject future punishment.

I have already shown how Mr. Murray and Mr. Mitchell regarded modern Universalism. You will perceive that Universalists bear little good-will toward the Restorationists.

In 1831, the editor of the "Trumpet" attempted to prevent the settlement of a preacher in Chesterfield, New Hampshire, on the ground that he "was opposed to the doctrines of ultra-Universalism," and that though a member of the "Providence Association," (the Restorationist body,) that did not entitle him to the fellowship of Universalists, for that association "has nothing to do with the Universalist denomination." (*Trum.* vol. iii. 182.) The Restorationists are called "a new denomination," (*Trum.* iii. 201,) and their separation from the body of Universalists is announced publicly. (*Trum.* iv. 38.) In vol. v. 118, there is a most imbittered article against the Restorationists; and, on page 122, the editor declares that the opposition of the Restorationists to "*Universalists is strong and unintermitting;*" that "*the Universalists in Massachusetts are not opposed more bitterly by any sect, than by the members of the Restorationist Association.*"

In another part of this lecture, I shall introduce the testimony of Restorationists in respect to the moral tendency of Universalism. This testimony will account, in part, for the hostility of Universalists toward them.

Third Downward Step.

After the rejection of the Deity of Christ, and the doctrine of future retribution, the flood-gates of error seemed to be lifted up, and all the doctrines of the cross were soon swept away.

Sin was declared not to be an evil. The existence of hell was denied. The being of the devil was rejected. The immortality of the soul was set down as a relic of heathenism. The existence of angels was denied, those passages which speak of angels being regarded as figures of speech, intended to represent messengers or ministers who preach the gospel.

Fourth Downward Step.

The institutions of religion were next assailed by Universalists. They regard the SABBATH as an institution observed on the ground of expediency, and not of divine appointment. To labor on the Sabbath would not, in their opinion, be sinful, though it might be improper. Journeys of pleasure are begun on the Sabbath. Secular employments are engaged in by officers in Universalist churches, on the principle that the Sabbath is a human institution. I have, on the Sabbath, passed, on my way to the church, from the house in which I now write, the workshop of one of

the Universalist deacons in this place, and seen him engaged in painting wagon-wheels in the highway. And as I paused to look at him, he seemed as little discomposed, as when handing around the wine to his fellow-communicants.

Nor are these opinions and practices peculiar to laymen. It is a fact of public notoriety, that the leading preachers in the Universalist connection are in the habit of passing the intermission of the Sabbath in selling books, settling accounts, and doing any business that falls in their way.

Abel C. Thomas, pastor of the Second Universalist Society in Lowell, a man of some notoriety among his sect, used all the influence he possessed to induce some young men in Lowell to work for him on the Sabbath. He told them they must do it; that there was no harm in it; that he had done so himself repeatedly; and, finally, that no one could see them if they would put curtains up to their windows. I insert the certificate with which I have been favored by the young men referred to.

"The undersigned state that, in the month of February, 1840, while Mr. Watson was engaged in printing a pamphlet concerning 'Miller's Theory,' for Abel C. Thomas, it appearing that the work could not be issued at the time required, Mr. Thomas suggested in our hearing that it might be done if the hands would work on the intervening Sabbath, saying that each might '*stick up a little curtain at the window, so as not to disturb any* body;' adding

that '*he had done it many a time*,' and that '*there was no harm in it*,' or something to that amount.

"A. E. NEWTON.
"J. J. JUDKINS.
"GEORGE N. BROWN.

"*Lowell*, July 19, 1841."

Mr. Thomas has publicly acknowledged that he did use the language here attributed to him; and defends his conduct on the ground that the Sabbath is not a divine institution. Besides, having the fact established, that Universalists do reject the claims of the Sabbath as a divine appointment, we have a practical commentary upon one part of the Bible. The command of God is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" which, by way of interpretation, Mr. Thomas being authority, must mean, "When you work on the Sabbath, put curtains up to your windows."

How long would the Sabbath be hallowed if such sentiments were to prevail? How long would it take to corrupt our youth, if men professing to be the ministers of Christ were to visit them, urge them to break the law of God, assure them that there is no harm in it, and, as an inducement, offer their own example and practice? Can any one believe that God would first command us to keep the Sabbath holy, and then send a company of men to urge us to violate his command?

The institution of the Lord's supper is not sacred in the eyes of modern Universalists. Some reject the *institution* altogether. They say that Christ simply

ate the Jewish passover, and that it is no more binding on us than circumcision, or any other Jewish rite. Others teach that it was to continue in force till the destruction of Jerusalem, when it was abolished; while others, who observe the supper, deny that it has any thing sacred in it; it is open to all; all who are fit to attend meeting, are fit for the communion. In most of the societies in the cities and large towns, churches may be found. But these are invariably small; twenty being probably a large average of Universalist church members. This fact appears singular at the first view. All can go to the table; all, on their ground, have a right there; and no barriers are in the way. Why, then, do so few attend? I reply, that it is felt to be too serious a matter to be trifled with. There is, in the community, so much latent Orthodoxy, that even these men are affected by it. And then the Bible gives some solemn admonitions on this subject. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." (1 *Cor.* xi. 29.) Men are willing to hear Universalism preached; they are willing to profess, defend, and support it; but they are not quite ready to incur the curse denounced upon those who eat or drink unworthily.

Among the few who unite in such an association, the principal inducement is, to be like other denominations, and do away the reproach that the sect is infidel. This is the strong argument used by preachers, when they urge men to unite with their church.

When I removed to Salem, Massachusetts, though the church had been organized over thirty years, it con-

tained but about twenty members. As I presented the subject to their attention, and urged the members of my congregation to come to the communion, some would laugh at me; some tell me that "that would be carrying the joke too far;" others would say that "they were Universalists if they were any thing;" while many would own that they were not confirmed in Universalism, and thought that a change of character was necessary to salvation.

Men join a Universalist church as they would a lyceum, and leave it in the same way. A profession of faith throws over them no new restraint; it imposes no new obligation. A change of character is not necessary to the enjoyment of its privileges. Profaneness is no disqualification for church membership; deism is none; atheism is none.

In all the Universalist churches in Boston, there may be found men habitually profane. They are among the oldest and most influential members. The same remark holds true in respect to all the Universalist churches in the vicinity of Boston. Indeed, it is true of all churches of that sect which I have any acquaintance with. I speak advisedly on this subject, and challenge contradiction. I have broken the bread at the communion table, frequently, to persons whom I knew to be habitually profane swearers. In many churches you will find deists; and, in one of the oldest Universalist churches in the vicinity of Boston, there was a man who was an atheist. His usual practice was, to attend the Universalist meeting in the *morning*, and go into Boston, and hear Abner Kneeland, *in the* afternoon. except on communion Sabbaths,

when he would pass the afternoon in his own church, to partake of the sacrament.

When I resided in Haverhill, a man joined my church. The next week he attended the annual muster, and spent a large part of the day in gambling. I know of one Universalist preacher who used to call the sacrament the "devil's supper," and yet, without any change of views, administer the ordinance whenever called upon for that purpose.

Men are not required or expected to be better men because they profess Universalism. They can lead the same prayerless, profane, and irreligious life they led before. They can play at cards, drink, gamble, and attend balls and theatres, with a full conviction that this conduct is inconsistent with no profession which they have made.

Fifth Downward Step. — Universalism leads to Infidelity.

1. Carry out those principles of interpretation by which Universalism is deduced from the Bible, and objections to it removed, and you will deduce, not only deism, but atheism, also, from the Scriptures. A man who believes Universalism upon the reasoning of its advocates, will, if he is a consistent man, be compelled to admit the claims of atheism.

If it be proof that there is no such being as Satan, because the term in the Bible is sometimes applied to men, then there is no God, for the same reason. If there be no evil angels, because the terms used to indicate them are employed to designate bad men, *then there can be no* holy angels, because this phrase

is sometimes appropriated to good men. If there be no hell, because the original word, in its primary sense, did not denote the world of woe, then there can be no heaven, for the original word, so far from teaching a state of immortal felicity beyond the grave, only signified the atmosphere which surrounds the globe.

If the phrases "everlasting punishment," "everlasting destruction," "eternal damnation," do not point out an endless state of suffering, then there can be no proof of endless felicity; for the same epithets are used to denote the duration of punishment that are used to denote the duration of felicity. No others are used, — no stronger can be used. By their very principles of interpretation, Universalists must become infidels, for those principles deny future existence, as well as future retribution. Such interpretation has been, and ever must be, the prolific source of infidelity.

2. Infidels have a great sympathy with Universalism. They frequently hold important offices in Universalist societies, and are among the most active members. I have already stated that the Universalist society in Hartford was mostly composed of infidels. The principal men, the most active and liberal in pecuniary matters, were of this character. Nor is this the first time this has been told. Mr. J. Bisbee, when pastor, spoke openly and boldly, in the pulpit and out, of that prominent feature of the society; and it is well known that his plainness on this subject drove him from the society.

And I know that my warmest and best friends,

while pastor of the society, — those most constant at meeting, — women as well as men, — avowed themselves to me to have no faith in the Bible.

It will be but just to let infidels speak for themselves. An infidel agent at the west writes to a friend in Boston, as follows: "There are thousands and tens of thousands of skeptics and liberals throughout the western country. And in the absence of more liberal and philosophical lecturers, they employ Universalists. For two years past, the liberals in this town have employed and paid a Universalist preacher. But the moment I arrived, he was set aside. Indeed, the Universalist clergymen here are not to be sneezed at. Mr. Kidwell [one of the oldest and most popular Universalist clergymen in Ohio] preached last Sabbath. I went to hear him; and, of a truth, he preached as good sense, reason, philosophy, liberality, as I want to hear, or expect to. In short, he is a very good Kneeland man." (*Inves.* July 19, 1840.)

When Frances Wright gave her lectures in Boston, the Universalists were among her most ardent admirers. And it was confidently asserted, by leading Universalists in Boston and vicinity, that what she taught was what Universalism would be in twenty years.

The prominent ministers of Universalism were among her audiences, and were seated upon the stage with her at the Federal Street theatre. She visited them at their houses. And I heard Mr. Ballou, of Boston, say that he agreed with Miss Wright in the *sentiments she* advanced in her lectures, except in one

thing; what she called *religion*, he should call *superstition*. She opposed religion. Mr. Ballou opposed superstition. But both opposed the same thing under different names.

Since that period, Miss Wright has felt toward Mr. Ballou the warm respect of a zealous coadjutor. This may be seen from the following letter, which, with a notice accompanying it, I take from the "Trumpet" of December 10, 1836. It was copied into that paper from "Zion's Herald."

"FRANCES WRIGHT DARUSMONT has made a moving appeal, in the 'Investigator,' for one of the Universalist meeting-houses, in which she may hold forth. It seems, by the following paragraph, that she *entertains a high respect for Mr. Ballou.* The infidels seem, of late, to be courting the favor of the Universalists very much. What can be the object? a union of the two parties?

"'I hereby request, most respectfully, permission to occupy any one of the more commodious Universalist churches, on any evening of the first week in December, for the purpose explained, namely, *the elucidation of the subject of southern slavery.* It would please me more especially to be permitted to occupy that of Mr. Ballou, for whose character I entertain high respect. With all due deference, therefore, I prefer to him more especially this request.

"'FRANCES WRIGHT DARUSMONT.'"

Infidels are admitted into Universalist meeting-*houses,* to lecture upon infidelity. This is true of

Milford, Attleboro', Pawtucket, and other places. The sympathy of infidels with Universalism may be seen by the following extract from the "Trumpet:"—

"I would allude to another town, not a thousand miles from Marblehead, where, previous to the establishment of a Universalist society, some *fifty* of Abner Kneeland's papers went regularly; but *since* Universalism has found a footing there, those papers have dwindled away almost to nought. I ask the reader again to make his inference."

The inferences we make are these: first, that it is perfectly natural for the "Trumpet" to take the place of Abner Kneeland's paper; secondly, that Universalism, to all intents and purposes, fully meets the wishes of infidels.

When the tidings reached this country of the infidelity in Germany, it was hailed with joy by Universalists. The news was published in their periodicals, under the imposing caption of "Glorious news from Germany." Public meetings were held, resolutions passed, speeches made, and a day of thanksgiving appointed, in attestation of their joy.

One of the most learned defences of Universalism that has been published, was written by T. S. Smith, of England. And yet, after laboring to prove that Universalism was the doctrine of the Bible, that gentleman threw the Bible aside, and is now an infidel.

The Purchase Street Universalist Society in Boston, called the Sixth, in 1840 ran down. Its minister renounced Universalism. The hall and fixtures were transferred to the infidels, who hold meetings in it on the *Sabbath*. *And* among the most active in the

infidel meetings, may be found the men who got up and sustained, while it existed, the Universalist society.

The editor of "Zion's Advocate," in giving an account of a Baptist association at Turner, Maine, remarks, —

"We are not acquainted with any other town in the state, where Universalist sentiments have obtained so much control. And the history of that doctrine here is a just commentary on its tendency. Not a few have passed the purgatory of Universalism into the paradise of infidelity.

3. The testimony of men who have been led into infidelity by Universalism proves the same thing. Mr. Kneeland was many years one of the most popular advocates of Universalism. He is now an atheist. He states most explicitly, that Universalism is but a stepping-stone to infidelity. Years before he publicly renounced his faith in the Bible, he was known to be an infidel. His ministerial associates knew this. But it did not hurt his standing, or injure his popularity. When he preached in Philadelphia, long before he openly rejected Christianity, he had discarded the whole Bible, excepting the book of Luke; and the beginning of that he thought had better be dispensed with. Mr. Kneeland says that he, as an atheist, has reached his position only by carrying out those principles of interpretation which, when a Universalist, he brought to the Bible.

Rev. O. A. Bronson, who was an influential defender of Universalism in Western New York, gives the following, as his experience upon this subject. It is from a review of "Whitman's Letters," published in the "Monitor."

"In his eleventh Letter, Mr. Whitman presents his objections to Universalism. They are truly formidable, and most of them are well founded. To many of them we can bear the testimony of melancholy experience. That the legitimate tendency of Universalism, — or at least the present manner of teaching it, — is to skepticism, we have not the least doubt. The writer of this 'Review' was for a number of years associated with the Universalists as a preacher, and as the editor of a Universalist periodical. It was very common for the clergymen with whom he was acquainted, to speak of Universalism as a 'stepping-stone,' as 'the best weapon to destroy the Orthodox, do away the clergy, and to prepare the way for something *better*.' Of the twenty-five hundred subscribers to the paper which he conducted, it was presumed that more than half were skeptics, or at least skeptical. He has conversed with hundreds of professed Universalists, who would own to him that they support Universalism only 'because it was the most *liberal* sentiment they could find, and because it was better than deism to put down the Orthodox.'"

Men settled over Universalist congregations, and editing Universalist periodicals, have been allowed to advocate infidel sentiments, and do so unrebuked. They have engaged to join infidel communities, and have spoken contemptuously of the ministry as a calling; yet retain their standing in the denomination.

When these things are charged home upon Universalism, its advocates appeal, by way of offset, to the fact that three or four books have been written by some of their preachers in defence of Christianity —

books unknown save among themselves. In his "Guide to Universalism," Mr. Whittemore seems to be conscious of the infidel tendencies of his writing; for, at the close of the work, he inserts Leslie's "Short and Easy Method with the Deists;" as if convinced that the bane and the antidote ought to go together.

4. Universalists sometimes state that their explanations of the Bible have been the means of converting infidels to the Christian religion. But how is it done? Simply by levelling Christianity to Universalism; by striking out of the Bible or explaining away all that is offensive to them; by making it teach just as infidelity teaches. The infidels are unchanged. And if they receive the Bible through the instruction of Universalism, it is because the Bible is made to harmonize, in appearance, with their views.

Infidels, as a general rule, are intelligent men. They reject the Bible, because it teaches the doctrines which the Orthodox find in it. I was once in conversation with an infidel, a member of my society. I was attempting to bring him to receive the Bible, by explaining away its threatenings. Having heard me for a while patiently, he, at length, interrupted me with the remark, "It is of no use to talk in that way; the Bible is full of hell, and every body knows that it is."

A few months since, I was conversing with a Universalist upon the doctrines of the gospel. He pronounced them to be unreasonable and absurd. He cited in proof the opinion of infidels, who unanimously rejected them on that ground. I replied, "Ask the

infidel who rejects these doctrines, why he rejects the Bible, and he will tell you that he does it because the Bible contains those very sentiments against which he speaks. Hence, the infidel being the judge, Universalism has no place in the Bible."

To make these men believers by bringing the Bible down to their notions, would be as irrational as the attempt to make rogues honest men, by abolishing the laws they violate.

When infidels join Universalists, and take upon themselves that name, and profess to be hearty in the cause, it is not because they have changed their ground; but they find in Universalism the same general principles they professed before. They can better secure the end they have in view in that disguise, than by open infidelity. An influential member of my society in Hartford, a physician, was an open infidel. When I asked him why he joined the Universalists, he replied, "Because they are the nearest to nothing, of any thing I know of."

5. A peaceful death in infidelity is regarded as a triumph of Universalism. This the following statement will show. It is from the pen of a highly-respected clergyman, who knew the young man, and all the circumstances which he records.

"In the town of Springfield, Massachusetts, lived a young man of respectable connections, who was early led astray by evil and unprincipled associates. Having broken away entirely from the moral restraints that were thrown around him in early life, he abandoned himself to the perpetration of vice in its most degrading forms. He was habitually profane: profane-

ness seemed to issue from his lips as naturally as his breath.

"About the age of twenty-one years, he was seized with a mortal disease; the result, as was supposed, of a life of dissipation. He was visited frequently, during his sickness, by pious friends, who took a deep interest in his welfare. These visits were always received with displeasure. In these interviews, he always ridiculed the idea of a future state, and spoke with perfect contempt of every thing of a serious nature. He said he had not read the Bible for years, and that he never wished to read it, or hear it read again. He died a bold blasphemer and a professed atheist.

"His funeral was attended by a Universalist minister. He eulogized the young man's character, and, to a large concourse of young people, held up this dissolute infidel as a '*pattern for their imitation.*' He was spoken of as having '*finished his allotted work on earth, and gone to heaven.*' His death was said to afford '*another evidence of the triumph of Universalism in the dying hour.*'"

In what respect, then, I ask, does Universalism differ from infidelity? What are its doctrines, but "deism in disguise," as Mr. Mitchell pronounced them to be? Could not atheists and deists receive the Bible as the basis of their theories, if they would adopt the course pursued by Universalists? What is there to prevent the atheist from making the Bible his text-book, if he may strike out all the passages that speak of the existence of God? In what respect do infidels have looser *notions* of the Sabbath, of prayer, and the institutions *of religion*, than those expressed by Universalists?

The difference is in favor of deism; for Universalism has denied those obvious truths which reason and nature teach.

6. Universalism inspires no respect for the institutions of Christianity. Universalists look upon their preachers as hired men, who preach only for money; who will go where they can get the most of it; and, when one is gone, his place may be easily supplied by another equally as good.

The minister of the First Universalist Society in Boston once reproved one of the most influential members of his society for profane swearing. His reply was, "I know that I swear a great deal, and you pray a great deal; but we do not either of us mean any thing by it;" thus making his swearing equally important, or equally harmless, as the prayers of his pastor.

Their places of worship have in their eyes nothing of a sacred character. They are opened for infidel lecturers, and for theatrical shows and exhibitions. In proof of this, read the following from the "Trumpet" of April 6, 1839:—

"*Dramatic Exhibitions in Milford, Mass.* Somebody has sent us a bill of a dramatic exhibition, given by the Milford Social Club, at the UNIVERSALIST MEETING-HOUSE IN MILFORD, on Friday evening, 29th ult., consisting, 1st, of the tragedy of Douglas; 2d, a few silly songs; and 3d, a farce, in one act, called a Race for a Dinner; the whole concluded with the Raccoon Hunt, by Mr. Freeman."

I saw, some time ago, a bill, advertising a circus in *Pawtucket, Rhode* Island. As an inducement for peo-

ple to attend, it was announced, that the profits resulting from the exhibition would be appropriated to the building of a Universalist meeting-house in that town. It speaks volumes for the moral sense of that community, that the receipts were less than the expenses. What worse, or what more of evil, could infidelity do, than this?

7. The only institution for education that has had any success among Universalists, shows the tendency of the system to infidelity.

The Clinton Liberal Institute, at Clinton, New York, is a denominational school. One of the most distinguished clergymen of the Universalist sect in New York became its agent. It was commended to the patronage of the Universalist community as their institution, and by them sustained. But it is essentially an infidel institution. It was founded as such. The charter and articles of compact were framed by men who designed to teach infidelity under the name of Universalism. It was so understood by the Universalist clergy, to whom these facts are well known. The articles of government forbid the introduction of religion into the Institute. Neither public prayer, nor the reading of the Bible, as an act of religious worship, can be performed in the school.

The design of the friends of this institution, in establishing it, may be learned from Universalists themselves.

"We bespeak the attention of a liberal and enlightened public to this literary institution. Disgusted with the continual intermeddling of sectarists, and with the undue, unjustifiable, and unwarrantable

exertions made to bend the minds of the rising generation into a certain train of thinking, and to the adoption of certain prescribed notions of religion, as was witnessed at all our seminaries of learning; and determined to no longer submit to a policy that reduced every thing to an engine for promoting sectarian purposes, — a few liberal-minded individuals conceived the noble idea of raising and establishing an institution based on such principles as should forever exclude the religious domination of the clergy, and where the youth might receive a polite and liberal education, untrammelled by the superstitious dogmas of the age, and where they should be permitted to enjoy their own private opinions, without being reproached or taunted for the sentiments they chanced to embrace." (*Mag. and Adv.* vol. v. 12.)

S. R. Smith, the agent of the Institute, thus writes: "No public religious services can be performed during class hours; and no minister, of any sect, may hold meetings in the Institute." (*Trum.* Aug. 21, 1841.) That is, the school can neither be opened nor closed by prayer or the reading of the Bible.

Mr. Grosh says, "The constitution forbids the performance of *public* religious services within the walls of the institution." (*Mag.* v. 134.) The character of the institution can never change. "The articles of the constitution, which secure the religious liberty of the students, are unalterable." (*Mag.* vii. 6.)

Recently a legacy has been left to the institution, by one of the founders of the school, upon condition that every teacher professing Christianity shall be ex-

cluded from the school. And Mr. S. R. Smith says, "When the legacy becomes due, no teacher shall be employed who is a professor of the Christian religion." (*Trum.* Aug. 21, 1841.) Again, he says, "The first step was deliberately taken for its [the Institute's] creation by the 'Central Association of Universalists,' in the state of New York, which appointed, as was thought, a full board of Universalist trustees, with the exception of one or two instances. The executive committee were, and continue to be, professed Universalists, who give their entire influence to the support of that denomination." (*Christ. Mess.* Oct. 9, 1841.)

That the institution is in all respects a Universalist school, the following authority will prove: —

"At a meeting of the trustees and executive committee of the Clinton Liberal Institute, Aug. 21, 1841, it was resolved, that the Clinton Liberal Institute was projected by Universalists; its substantial and commodious buildings erected and paid for with their money; and its library and apparatus presented by their liberality; and, moreover, the said Institute has always been controlled, and principally sustained, by that denomination." (*Christ. Mess.* Sept. 11, 1841.)

If any further proof was needful, the south would furnish it. Universalists have made great efforts to spread their sentiments at the south, but without success. The frankness of the southern character disdains disguise. Those who are religious give Universalism no countenance; those who are not *wish for no* cloak. It is no reproach at the south

to be irreligious; at the north it is. Universalism flourishes at the north; in the south it cannot live. The same class in the one section who embrace Universalism, in the other are open infidels.

Besides this proof of its tendency to infidelity, allow me to ask, What claim has Universalism upon the world, in a moral point of view, which infidelity cannot make? Universalism cannot present one sanction that may not be found in deism. Deism has more sanctions than Universalism can urge. It has all the motives to a good life which can be drawn from this world. And then it presents that natural dread of something after death, which makes the worst of men "rather bear the ills they have, than fly to others that they know not of."

But Universalism sweeps this all away. It assures men that they have nothing to fear after death; and that any man who has courage to break the brittle thread of life, will step at once beyond the reach of sorrow and suffering, into perfect happiness forever. The point is sustained, I conceive, that Universalism tends to infidelity.

Need I add more to prove the downward tendency of Universalism, in doctrine? Within fifty years, it has run through all the grades of unbelief, down to deism, and even below it. No intelligent deist, not even Thomas Paine, has denied the immortality of the soul, or the doctrine of future retribution. Mr. Paine believed in both these sentiments, alleging that reason and nature taught them. Universalism already has gone *below deism*. What its next development *will be, we cannot* tell. How literally, in the history

of this delusion, are fulfilled the words of Paul—"But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived"! (2 *Tim.* iii. 13.)

II. UNIVERSALISM IS DOWNWARD IN PRACTICE.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not mean to assert that all the advocates of Universalism are immoral men. I do not mean to say that, as soon as a man receives this doctrine, he runs down at once to the lowest point of degradation. His early habits, the power of early religious instruction, may neutralize his errors. He may be a moral man, in spite of his demoralizing creed.

Were I to give my opinion of atheism, I should say, that it saps the foundation of religious fear and human accountability. It derides law and its sanctions, by denying the existence of the lawgiver and the judge. But we do not always see the legitimate tendency of atheism in those who profess it. We do not always witness that daring impiety, which springs from the theory, and which spurns the providence of God, and laughs at all devotion as the offspring of a blind credulity. The strength of early and good impressions; the religious atmosphere that surrounds them; the strong moral feeling that pervades the community,—prevent the atheist from exhibiting in full the practical results of his evil principles. But for all that, atheism, in its nature, is demoralizing, and at war with righteousness, though some atheists may be amiable men. So with Universalism. As a

system, it is altogether immoral; and it is with its practical tendency we have now to do.

1. *Universalism promotes Impiety.*

It breaks up the devotional and religious habits of men, and often suddenly. The evidence of conversion to Universalism is seen in their change of character in this respect, in the violation of the Sabbath, and in refusing to attend meeting, and to support the preacher. In no one thing, perhaps, is the downward practical tendency so clearly seen as in this point. A Christian becomes cold and careless. He neglects secret prayer; then prayer at the family altar is omitted; then social prayer; then comes an absence from public worship a part of the day; then follows an occasional attendance upon Universalist preaching; then excommunication; then an open profession of Universalism.

On the other hand, when a Universalist has serious impressions, or begins to make religion a personal matter, he abandons his system. He has no longer need of a cloak. It is an argument of no mean power against Universalism, that nearly every Christian has examined its claims, and rejected it.

A person is impressed with the necessity of preparing to meet God. He is attached to his sins, but he does not wish to perish. He finds two theories in the community. The one tells him that the great purpose of this life is to fit men for the next, and that, without holiness, no man can see the Lord. The other teaches him that the present life has no connection with the future, and that all that men

suffer for sin they suffer in this world. Suppose he reads the following, taken from the "Trumpet:"—

"Our confidence is in God. Sin is misery; it is hell; it is punishment. But God can cleanse the foulest heart; he can make the vilest clean. Though our sin is as scarlet, he will make it white as snow; and though it be like crimson, it shall be like wool. So saith the Word. Neither death nor sin can have any dominion beyond the resurrection. God hath promised it. We depend on him. All live unto God. 'The lamp holds out to burn' *forever*, in his presence; and we rejoice in believing HE WILL DO ALL THINGS WELL."

This is what the man wants to believe. But why does he not trust it? He dares not. For, unless he denies the truths of the Bible, he feels and knows that such sentiments are false. And, though his lusts plead for them, and his sins urge him to take shelter beneath them, conscience gives him no rest till he escapes entirely from this refuge of lies. Far from creating devout habits in the impious, Universalism breaks up those previously formed under the influence of an opposite belief.

I have often been struck with the change in the characters of men, when converted to Universalism. Before their conversion, they had a family altar; afterwards, it was thrown down. Before, they would devote the Sabbath to religious worship; afterwards, to business, recreation, or pleasure. Before, they were liberal in supporting not only the public worship of God, but the benevolent institutions of the church; afterwards, the smallest sum was given with

extreme reluctance. I was once instrumental in persuading a young man to embrace my system. He was an artist by profession. He had been religiously educated, was very moral, a strict observer of the Sabbath, and punctual in his attendance upon public worship. I had great difficulty in removing the many objections he urged against Universalism. At length he was satisfied to rest his hopes of heaven upon that foundation In less than six months from the hour in which he embraced it, his moral sense was so impaired, that he used to work upon the Sabbath.

2. *It is positively licentious in its Tendency.*

It must be so, from the very nature of its doctrines It destroys human accountability, makes sin no evil in the sight of God, and removes all fear of retribution in the world to come. It makes sin to be all the punishment men can suffer for their sins, and the violation of God's law the penalty for the violation. This may very well be illustrated by the following anecdote from the "Life of Garrick:"—

"The lecture upon the non-credenda of the free-thinkers was repeated so often, [at Mr. Mallet's table,] that the inferior domestics became soon as able disputants as the heads of the family. The fellow who waited at table, being thoroughly convinced that for any of his misdeeds he should have no account to make, was resolved to profit by the doctrine, and made off with many things of value, particularly the plate. Luckily, he was so closely pursued, that he was brought back with his prey to his master's house, *who examined him* before some select friends. At

first the man was sullen, and would answer no question put to him; but, being urged to give a reason for his infamous behavior, he resolutely said, 'Sir, I had heard you so often talk of the impossibility of a future state, and that after death there was no reward for virtue or punishment for vice, that I was tempted to commit the robbery.' 'Well; but, you rascal,' replied Mallet, 'had you no fear of the gallows?' 'Sir,' said the fellow, looking sternly at his master, 'what is tha to you, if I had a mind to venture that? You had removed my greatest terror; why should I fear the less?'"

On the Universalist plan, punishment is no curse; no exhibition of God's anger against sin; no token that God is displeased with evil. It is no more so than the rain, the sunlight, or the dew. All the warnings and threatenings are deceptive; for, on the ground of Universalism, they are nothing but displays of God's love. As well might you call a hospital "a prison," and threaten the sick that they shall be sent there to be punished, meaning nothing by your alarming threats, but that they shall be healed.

Suppose Congress should erect a vast hospital for all those who are wounded in brawls, or diseased from vice and crime. Let them endow it with great liberality, and throw open its doors to all the nation. Having done this, let them forbid rioting, drunkenness, and every vice; but, at the same time, announce that all who disobey shall be sent at once into this hospital, to be punished by being healed. Let it be *proclaimed*, "Poor men! their sickness is punishment *enough*; they are justly entitled to be cured, and re-

stored to society." Would such an establishment be favorable to public purity, or public morals? If not, then neither can the teachings of Universalism, in respect to the manner of God's dealing with sin.

Common observation must convince any man that the profane, the intemperate, the licentious, love this doctrine. They call it their own. They support it; they defend it. All such feel that they are not homeless. The general impression is, that such men will be zealous defenders of the blessed doctrine. When I was a settled Universalist preacher, all such bowed to me as their spiritual guide. When a man died of the delirium tremens, was hanged, or drowned by his own act, I was called, as a matter of course, to attend the funeral.

The class of persons usually collected together to hear a preacher of Universalism, is proof of its immoral tendency. They come not together to be made better. They seek not the restraints of religion and the sanctions of God's word. They have thrown them off, and come to Universalism to be strengthened in their course, and encouraged in their evil way.

Go where it is a novelty, and announce the preaching of Universalism. Into what places will the intelligence carry sadness? Into the bar-room, the dram-shop, or the gaming-room? Who will be made sad? The deist, the Sabbath-breaker, the intemperate, the adulterer? Will not these rather, with scarcely an exception, rejoice in the intelligence, and mostly make up the audience? They will be assisted, perhaps, by young men and boys; and especially by those who have *once been awakened,* but have again relapsed into sin.

This is a notorious fact. And why should it not be so? The Bible says that "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." It designates drunkards in a special manner as a class which shall not be saved. A drunkard does not wish to be lost. Neither is he willing to become a sober man. Why should he not love a doctrine which teaches him that his sin shall not exclude him from heaven?

The Bible says to the sinner, "Thou shalt surely die." He will not change his course of life. Must he not wish success to a cause which assures him that he may live and die in sin, and yet be saved?

Men unfaithful in their conjugal relations, who read that all such will have their part in the second death, must find great comfort in learning from Universalists that the Bible really means that all such are destined to heaven.

Young men and boys whose feet go down to death, and whose steps take hold on hell, must delight to be taught that for these sins God will not bring them into judgment.

I have repeatedly had my congregation follow me, upon the Sabbath, from the bar-room to the place of meeting, and then back again to the tavern. In the stage-coach, I have been extremely mortified, when defending Universalism, to have a profane, drinking, dissolute-looking person signify to me that he thought my argument conclusive, and that he agreed with me exactly. The exchange of significant glances among the passengers was any thing but pleasant to my *feelings.*

A clergyman who was settled in the western part

of the state of New York, who has since renounced Universalism, related to me the following, as a leaf from the book of his experience: —

Riding one day, he was overtaken by a storm, and compelled to take refuge in the first house that he saw. It proved to be a small tavern. The bar-room was crowded, and the usual amount of swearing, gaming, and drinking, was going on. He seated himself by the fire to dry his clothes. He was soon recognized by one who had "had the pleasure to hear him preach." A conversation began, and Universalism was defended to the satisfaction of all parties. Immediately in front of the minister sat a man who gave him undivided attention. He was a large man, bloated with intemperance, with a look indicating sottishness and an acquaintance with vice. At the close of the argument, he brought his hands together, exclaiming, "Good! Landlord, bring us another horn." The effect of that scene never left the preacher, till he left Universalism.

Similar facts have been noticed by others. I find in the Boston "Traveller" of September 2d, 1836, the following paragraph. It stands at the close of a letter from Bennington, Vermont.

"Speaking on temperance, calls to mind a fact I had yesterday, too good to be lost. A Universalist minister, not far from here, held a meeting in North Adams, a few Sabbaths since, and had quite a large audience to hear him. The next day, he returned, and declared he was never so much ashamed during the whole course of his ministry. He said that, just *at the close of the service*, a drunken, ragged, profligate

character came reeling up to the desk, and, grasping his hand, exclaimed, 'Friend, I am real glad to see you. The cause has been declining for years, and I have been wishing some one would come and preach it to us. You are a good fellow.' No wonder the divine was glad to get away, and was ashamed of his proselytes."

All persons who look at the results have the same opinion of its moral tendency. It bears the same fruit in all places.

Extract of a letter from a missionary of the Massachusetts Missionary Society, dated September 1, 1837, to the secretary: —

"I have been struck, since I have been here, with the unblushing arrogance of Universalism, as it is here denominated. There is in it no meekness, no forbearance, and nothing like the spirit of solemn, serious inquiry. The most exemplary friends of this religion I meet with, are fond of such a politico-style of talk on the subject as proceeds from all lips in the bar-room, the grog-shop, and other scenes of vulgarity. The lovers of Universalism, so far as I have become acquainted with them, manifest a singular relish for the discussion of the most sacred things in unbecoming situations and circumstances, while, in the solemn place of retirement, the subject of religion, with them, seems equally dry and uninteresting. They do not in all instances avoid private conversation on this subject, but then it is remarkable how readily all seriousness evaporates from their discourse, as soon as it is exposed to the air, or the hearing of their jovial associates. Those who, in the affairs of the world,

are of regular habits, and who are esteemed moral men, do evidently take a more lively interest in a bar-room defence of their faith than in the regular observance of public worship, even when conducted by men of their own sentiments.

"But nothing affords a better illustration of the arrogance of Universalism, than the readiness with which the most unlettered believers of this creed question any version of the Scriptures except such as is sanctioned by the 'Trumpet.' I have, in some instances, been forced to smile at the disgusting pedantry, that would, by way of anticipation, disarm me of the advantage of having spent a few years within the walls of a college. Ere I had dreamed of alluding to Greek or Hebrew in the smutty cell of mine undaunted host, he has gratuitously given me the definition of 'Sheol,' 'Hades,' 'Tartarus,' and 'Gehenna!'

"If ever I met with a priest-ridden people out of the 'Mother Church of Rome,' I have found them amongst the constant readers of the 'Trumpet;' and my mind is fully impressed with the idea, that no class of professed friends to the Bible in New England, would so soon yield to the jurisdiction of the pope, as the lower ranks of Universalists. The more intelligent class, embracing the managers, the spokesmen, and disputants, profess to read the Bible, and are ready to appeal to it as the standard of truth. Yet a short conversation with almost any of this class brings out the secret fact, that, after all, they consider the Bible *as a book* merely of good advice; while the *more thoughtless* and ignorant are often not ashamed

to acknowledge that 'the "Trumpet" contains enough of the Bible for them.'"

Rev. J. M. Peck, general agent of the Baptist Publication Society, thus writes in the Christian Watchman, August 5, 1842: — "Passing along the streets of Louisville, Kentucky, last December, my attention was arrested by a singular congruity of signs over a store. Immediately above the door, in large letters, was the significant word GROCERY, which, in western parlance, means a retail whisky shop; and, on another board projecting from the corner of the same establishment, in conspicuous letters, I read, 'UNIVERSALIST BOOKS FOR SALE HERE.'"

In "Zion's Herald," December 8, 1836, I find the following: —

"Some few years ago, the Universalists obtained possession of a church, in a town on the banks of the Quinnebaug, in the county of Worcester. They formed their society, and hired their minister. Sabbath after Sabbath, they would repair to the church, to hear from their Balaam the tidings of great joy. But they were not content, — and we could hardly expect it of men constantly in hell. True, they did not ask for Lazarus to dip his finger in *water*, and *cool their parched tongues*; — they took a course the rich man never thought of; — but they *did* send one of their number to the retailer's, and procured a *quantum sufficit* of ardent spirits. They deposited it in an old school-house near by, and, every Sabbath noon, thither they repaired to guzzle down their alcohol; and *thus they* realized, probably, their only *spiritual benefit*. These acted in consistency with the first

duty, to make the best of the world while they staid in it."

"This may certify, to whom it may come, that, some years since, the Universalists alternately occupied a meeting-house in the town of Southbridge, Worcester county, Massachusetts. At that time I heard it stated, by one of those who attended said meeting, himself a Universalist, that he, with several other persons, who attended said meeting, had, for their accommodation, spirituous liquor kept in a chest, deposited in an old house formerly a school-house, to which place they did repair on Sunday noons. Of the truth of the above I have no reason to doubt; and have never since heard any thing stated, by any person, that it was not so.

"The above certificate is given at the request of Mr. Tracy. JOHN M'KINSTRY.

"*Southbridge, Dec.* 23, 1835."

I knew a similar case in Stafford, Connecticut. The tavern was near the Universalist meeting-house. At noon, a great part of the congregation usually adjourned to the tavern. They went into the hall, however, and not into the bar-room. It was ascertained, in a short time, that, by an agreement with the landlord, a decanter of spirit was placed in the closet of the hall. All who chose had access to it, drank, and laid their money on the shelf. The wife of the landlord, one Sabbath morning, removed the decanter. The indignation of his customers was unbounded. They appealed to the owner of the house, who was

also the chief man in the Universalist society. He advised the landlord to satisfy their thirst, adding, as a reason, that, if he did not, their "society would all be broken up."

In the year 1839, I was invited to preach in the town of Lee, New Hampshire. The Sabbath was very pleasant, and a great concourse of people attended meeting. At the close of the morning service, we all went to the tavern. During the intermission, the bar-room was full, and the incessant sound of the toddy-stick announced to me that the waiter was constantly employed. The weather being warm, and the doors all open, I could hear the discussion of the merits of the sermon, and the commendations, mingled with oaths, which they bestowed upon the preacher. All were not thus employed. Some were trading horses; some betting on the relative speed of their animals, and threatening to test the matter when meeting should be done. At the close of the meeting, a scene occurred that I cannot represent. It seemed like the breaking up of some military review. So much cursing and swearing, rude and vulgar jesting, horse-racing and running, that my pen can do little towards describing it. I turned from the whole spectacle sick at heart; ashamed, mortified, and alarmed, that I was the preacher of a doctrine which called such a collection and such characters together. I resolved to do no more to sustain such a gathering. Nor were my feelings soothed by a knowledge of the fact, that the landlord had contributed largely to defray the expenses of my *visit.* And he was ready to do the same thing again *whenever* I would visit the place. It was the best *day he had* seen for a year.

In Epping, New Hampshire, when the Universalists were about to build a meeting-house, they could not agree upon a location. The reason was, that two of the principal men kept tavern in different parts of the town. Each was determined that the building should stand near his own tavern, in order to receive the Sunday custom. When it was decided in favor of one of them, the other was offended, withdrew all support from the society, and, the last I knew of him, had never entered the meeting-house.

3. *Formation and Character of Universalist Societies.*

Universalist societies are not composed of the sober and intelligent part of the community; much less of the moral and religious. In them you may find many amiable men, who would have been so had they been deists or atheists. At the spread of Universalism, the sober part of society, which sustains the institutions of morality and religion, is made sad. Societies thus formed are gathered, not by religious principle, but out of a spirit of opposition; not to build up righteousness, but to pull down Orthodoxy. They embrace the dissolute, the profane, the irreligious. They contain no abiding religious principle. The doctrines embraced by them do not produce love to God and love for religious things. They do not promote that desire to worship God, which prompts men to make any sacrifice to sustain it.

In Universalist societies, therefore, there is no stability. *Universalists* are constantly boasting of the *number of societies* formed among them. The public,

not knowing how the matter is managed, is deceived by such statements. It is supposed that these societies are formed for religious purposes, and maintain an existence; and such repeated organization, it is feared, will fill the land. Were Universalists to publish, in like manner, the names of all the societies that run wholly down, or sink into a state of suspended animation, the public would be undeceived.

Many are formed to day and die to-morrow. They are composed of discordant materials which cannot long hold together. One society is organized, because there is a revival of religion in the town; another, because the use of a church for a lecture has been refused; another, to keep women and children away from religious influence. Preaching is sustained awhile, till the fit of zeal has passed off; and then the whole attempt is abandoned. In New England alone, more than one hundred Universalist societies have run down since 1830. Some few of them I shall refer to in another place.

The prosperity of Universalism is measured by a very different standard from that which marked the prosperity of the gospel. At the day of Pentecost the gospel was triumphant, not because thousands heard it preached, but because three thousand were convicted, converted, and saved. In Corinth, the truth was glorified, not because Paul obtained a hearing, but from the fact that the profane, the adulterer, the blasphemer, repented, and were washed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. So is it, at the present day, with the increase of the gospel. In all evangelical churches, the evidence of the prosperity of truth

is seen in the reformation of bad men, and in the increased spiritual improvement of good men.

Not so with Universalism. It is considered as prosperous, because it is preached in a new place; or because numbers hear a particular sermon, and all who hear are set down as believers. Profaneness does not cease at its approach. Licentiousness is not stayed. Sabbath-breaking is not abandoned. Nor does solemnity, seriousness, or a favorable change in moral character, mark its progress. These fruits are not expected. In the absence of all good moral results, Universalism may still be triumphant in the opinion of its friends.

The character of these societies is so graphically described by one of the sect, that I will allow him to speak for them. Hosea Ballou, 2d, says, "Here is a [Universalist] society that has perhaps gathered in a considerable number of members, whose ability in worldly means is equal to that of any society in the town. Indeed, they sometimes congratulate themselves on their strength over a feebler society of another faith, which nevertheless manages to support constant preaching. They, on the other hand, feel that they cannot afford to settle a pastor nor indeed, to procure the ministration of the gospel more than a part of the year, — perhaps through the warm season, possibly but half of the time even then, or only occasionally. But when they do have preaching, the thing is done up in the earthquake style. Notice is published all abroad, and when the day arrives, *in* come the wagons and carriages, *horsemen* and footmen, from a dozen miles

around, and fill the church to overflowing. Many a glance is cast forth at the smaller neighboring congregation, — it is a wonderful triumph; they have beaten their neighbors twofold, and this was what they *meant* to do. The matter is talked of; perhaps they get it published; and then — their church is shut again, till they can gather excitability enough for another convulsion fit, or rather till the apparatus is ready for *galvanizing* the dead body once more. Horrible mockery of life! Would that such societies could see (but the dead cannot see) what they are doing. They are saying, in the face of all the world, Our religion is but a farce; there is no vital principle in it, that it can live on regularly from day to day, and from week to week; but the shock once over, it lies motionless as before. And the world understands all this; the moral sense of community revolts at it. * * * There are societies abroad in the country, which arose only to bring reproach on the cause, and whose worthless carcasses yet remain but half-buried, a festering corruption on the face of our land, preaching against us with a condemning voice, that not argument, but thorough-going repentance alone, can silence." (*Expositor*, vol. iii. p. 83, 84.)

This is a most accurate description, given, not by an enemy, but by a friend; not from report, but from actual knowledge; and by one, who, in company with myself, has assisted in *galvanizing* many a society of this description. There are scores of them in the country. And yet these claim to be Christian societies, *such as* Christ came from heaven to set up. Religion *is the* salt of the earth; and the establishment of a

Christian society is designed to reform men, and promote public virtue, as well as save the soul. But how many societies, such as Mr. Ballou has described, would it require to promote righteousness, and create a healthy moral atmosphere? societies compared to a corrupting carcass, putrid, festering, filling the air with disease and death? societies whose worship is compared to the ghastly effects of galvanism upon a dead body? Would it be well for our country, for the institutions of religion, and for the morals of the rising generation, if such societies were to increase till every town should feel the baneful influence of an "earthquake" meeting, or be pervaded by the pestilential atmosphere of a "festering corruption"?

And yet such societies do exist. The most casual observer must be aware of the dreadful moral influence which they put forth; and the lively description of them given above by a leader of the sect, so far from exciting a smile, should make us weep. We ought to weep that God is so dishonored, that Christ is so much blasphemed, that such fatal influences are employed to ruin souls, that our children have such temptations and delusions to insnare them and lead them down to death.

4. *Style of Preaching that is popular among Universalists.*

The great end of Universalist preaching is to prove that all men will be saved, to show that the doctrines of the Orthodox are absurd, and that no retribution is to be found in the future world. As long as a minister attends to this, all will go well. The declaration

that all men will be saved must be made in every sermon. There is so much in the Bible, in reason and conscience, which teaches the contrary, that an argument does not retain its hold more than a week. It must be repeated again and again. And then it does not satisfy the mind.

But let a minister preach plainly and frequently against profanity, drunkenness, gaming, or any of the alarming sins of the day, and he will at once be reproved. No society, that I ever knew, will bear such preaching. Indeed, to have something to talk about, men will endure a sermon once in a while rebuking their sins. But this must not be repeated too often. Universalists give their minister to understand distinctly that they do not come together for that purpose. They are united to put down Orthodoxy; and as for hearing their preacher often rebuke and reprove them, they are not disposed to it. They can hear enough of such preaching at Orthodox meetings.

During the latter part of my ministry as a Universalist, I was frequently censured, with oaths, because I did not preach Universalism enough; but enforced too much the practical duties of life. In Salem, I once preached upon righteousness and temperance. Some of my principal men came to me, and threatened to nail up their pews, if I meddled with that subject again. Had I added "judgment to come," I dare not anticipate what the result would have been.

Many confirmed Universalists are afraid of the influence of Universalism upon their families. Many *will not* bring up their children under its preaching. *Parents*, when they send their children away to school,

in a town in which there is a Universalist society, often order them to attend another meeting. And I am acquainted with families, in Boston, Salem, Hartford, and many other places, which have left Universalist meetings on account of their children. They profess still to be firm believers in the salvation of all, but, when asked why they do not hear the doctrine preached, will reply, "Our children are old enough to understand, and we prefer to have them under a different influence;" thus presenting the singular fact, that they are willing to trust their endless destiny on a foundation insufficient to secure the temporal welfare of their children.

Universalist congregations seldom increase. They may retain an existence for years. But after they have reached a certain height, they begin to wane. They start with zeal, and perhaps erect a house of worship. Then their downward march begins; and in this is seen the tendency of their doctrine. It removes restraint, loosens the bonds of moral obligation, and takes away the motives for attending public worship. Many, in a little time, learn out all that is taught. They become convinced that no one will be lost, and that was all they wished to know. Convinced of this, they leave the meeting, and spend the Sabbath in doing their own pleasure. The congregation of Universalists is thus continually changing. If new members come in, they only take the place of those, who, under the influence of the doctrine, have learned the folly of all preaching, and have come to the opinion that many better methods have been devised of spending the Sabbath, than attending

meeting, even though it be to hear the threatenings of the Bible explained away. Indeed, the ministry of Universalism soon relieves men from all trouble in relation to the right interpretation of the Bible, as it prepares the proselyte to reject that holy book as a fable.

Nor does my experience differ from that of others. All who have testified upon this subject have expressed the same views. This I shall show before I close this lecture, both by the testimony of preachers who have renounced Universalism, and of others who still advocate it.

5. *Universalism has no benevolent and liberalizing Tendency.*

Universalists boast of the good moral influence of their faith. We have proved it to be positively demoralizing. They claim for it a philanthropy and a benevolence not found in any system but theirs. The history of its influence will show how well founded this boasting is.

The believers in Universalism deny that God has affixed to his law the penalty of eternal death. They call this a cruel doctrine, — partial and contracting in its effect upon the mind. But no one can deny that those who believe in this sentiment have been pioneers in every benevolent work. Their faith has prompted them to deeds of benevolence to such an extent, that a good cause can hardly be found which they have not originated, and not one which they have not *helped* to sustain.

But what has Universalism done? Nothing,

What benevolent plan has it originated, to ameliorate the condition of men, or promote the interests of our race? What generous, noble, catholic enterprise tells of its liberality and benevolence? Not one. Which of the benevolent institutions, so peculiar to our age, has it ever aided? Not one. What has it done for the heathen? Nothing. Universalists have constantly ridiculed the exertions of those who are engaged in sending or carrying the gospel to the heathen. Neither have they, as a sect, contributed one cent towards the distribution of the Bible among the destitute.

As to the formation of Sabbath schools, Bible classes, as well as temperance societies, they, at the commencement of these enterprises, presented a united and incessant opposition. And this only ceased when opposition became odious to all. After these institutions had won their way to popular favor, and nothing could resist their influence, then the sect, in some measure, adopted these plans, or fell in with the prevailing taste. But this was done altogether in self-defence.

This is illustrated in the history of the temperance cause. From few sources has this reform met with so violent opposition as from the Universalist denomination. When this work began, the Universalist ministers preached against it, and the cause was opposed with great virulence in their periodicals. Some few favored the reformation; but they were compelled to be silent, or only allowed to speak at temperance conventions. Those who would advocate temperance *in their pulpits*, were dismissed.

The fact that many of the Universalist preachers *now* appear to be the friends of temperance, does not change the fact in relation to what they formerly did. It was well understood, among them, that policy required them to enlist in the temperance cause. By so doing, they could associate somewhat with ministers of the gospel, be recognised as such before the world, and, what was more important than all, they would *gain admittance into Orthodox pulpits.* These were the reasons assigned, by the advocates of Universalism, when I was among them, for their efforts in behalf of temperance.

Universalists have done comparatively nothing in favor of education. This is a great, a national object. Next to religion, it has claims upon us all. The Puritans had hardly obtained a shelter for themselves, after they landed upon the frozen shores of New England, before they made provision for the advancement of education. They laid the foundation of their social structure so deep, that it still stands, blessing us, and ready to bless generations to come.

Universalism has existed for half a century. Its friends say it has extended more rapidly than any other sentiment. What, then, has it done for education? I will do Universalism no injustice. I will let its advocates speak to this point. H. Ballou, 2d, says, —

"The present is emphatically an age of popular education. Already has great progress been made in this respect, and a system of measures is coming into *operation,* that promises to elevate the community to a *far higher* degree of culture and intelligence than it

has ever attained. Who are the leaders in this enterprise; ourselves, or others? Who are traversing our country, from state to state, from town to town, rousing the public mind to the subject, and calling forth its energies in the work? We fear that we should be found, on inquiry, to have taken but little active part in the movement, and to have yielded to it, rather than to have carried it forward. Again: the sects around us, the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Baptists, and lastly the Methodists, are entering with all their spirit into the higher departments of education. Their high schools are established in all our large towns; academies are rising up under their patronage on every hand; their colleges, with liberal donations, are multiplying over the country. It needs but little philosophy to perceive what must be the influence of these measures, extending as they do, in their ramifications, through the whole mass of society. To think of measuring the amount of their effects merely by the number of scholars in the several institutions, would be like estimating the quantity of light in an illuminated hall, by the solid contents of flame on the lamps. In both cases, the influence is *abroad* on all the face of the scene, in every nook and corner. To these schools go our young men and women in a constant succession, there to be imbued with new sentiments and tastes; and from these schools, in return, come our teachers, our lecturers, writers, the living host of minds that bear sway in every department of life and thought. What have we done towards providing for the demands that grow out of this state of things? In

New York, we have, indeed, an institution under our patronage, that bids fair to become, ere long, a *bona fide* college — thanks to the life-devoted exertions of a brother whom no apathy could discourage. In New England, we have passed votes, starved two academies to death, and *apotheosized* another into a university, and so sent it up to its home in the clouds. In the farther part of Maine, however, we have a high school, which appears to be doing well; also, an academy or two in Ohio, and — this is all."

The history of this school in New York — the "Clinton Liberal Institute," "which bids fair to become, ere long, a *bona fide* college" — I have already given. This is the only school that Universalists have in any degree sustained. And the note of alarm from its friends, recently sounded, indicates that symptoms of decline already appear in this institution. So much, and no more, Universalists themselves being witnesses, have they done for education since they have existed as a denomination. I need not stop one moment, to convince you that the condition of education, as well as of every thing good, would have been most deplorable, had Universalists settled New England, instead of our Puritan fathers.

It is of no avail to say that the sect is young. It has existed long enough to begin to be benevolent. Other sects have begun their benevolent deeds with the very commencement of their denominational existence. The Moravians began their apparently *hopeless* mission among the rude and benighted Greenlanders, before they numbered, as a denomination, two

hundred persons. If Universalism were a benevolent system, seeking the good of man, not ten years would have passed away without having in operation one systematic scheme of benevolence, intended to benefit our race and world.

Nor is it any excuse to say that Universalists like not the measures of the benevolent societies of the day; for they have the ability to strike out a path of their own.

But the truth is, the doctrine of this sect deals a death-blow at all benevolent plans. It teaches that this earth is just what God intended it should be. Man cannot change its character, if he would. And if God is well pleased with the world as it is, why should Universalists wish to change it?

6. *It dries up Human Affection.*

So far from creating love and good-will to men, Universalism breathes nothing but bitter hostility and hatred to all who differ from its communion. The organs of the sect have long been noted for their scurrility and abuse of all good men. The manner in which they speak of the benevolent operations of the day, the missionary and philanthropic movements of the age, is too familiar to require repetition. Their blasphemous opposition and ridicule of revivals of religion speak the temper of their minds. So powerful is the hatred which Universalism inspires for evangelical religion, that it has destroyed natural affection, and made the parent like the ostrich, who is "hardened against her young as if they were not *hers.*" *I have at hand* many proofs of this assertion

One or two cases I will present. The first I select from "Zion's Watchman," August 10, 1836.

"*Barbarity.* While on a visit to Norwich, Connecticut, a few weeks since, we found a young lady at the house of a friend, from whom we received the following account of the treatment which she had received from her own father; and, from what we learned from others, we believe no one who knows this young lady doubts, in the least, the truth of her statements.

"Her name is ———. She is motherless, and is about twenty-three years of age. Some time in the course of the last year, she commenced attending the Methodist church in the place, and was hopefully converted to God. As soon as her father ascertained that she had connected herself with the Methodist church, he commenced abusing her with profane language, and afterwards threatened to kill her.

"After she had stood out her time of probation, and had been admitted into full connection with the church, her father, as soon as he learned the fact, went into her chamber, and threatened her with instant death, if she did not dissolve her connection with the Methodist church forthwith. He stamped upon the floor, and swore in a most violent rage.

"Having on a pair of thick boots, he then commenced kicking her; and once he hit her in the side, the severe effects of which she has felt now more than four months. He next took his cane, and commenced beating her upon the back and head. With his cane he struck her twelve times, and the marks of the blows were seen upon her body two months afterwards.

"This man has since been heard to say that he would kill his daughter, if he could find her. When he attends any meeting, he goes to the Universalist."

Another is the case of a lady in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The facts I gathered from her own lips. She became interested in religion, and, in opposition to the wish of her father, left the Universalist meeting, and attended the Orthodox. When she was about to make a profession of religion, her father forbade her doing so. He threatened to disown her, and turn her from his house, if she did not retract. She went forward in the path of duty, and was banished from her father's house on that account. She has a brother who is a Universalist preacher. And when last I saw her, she was in exile from home, bearing the indignation of her father because she loved the Savior.

Another instance fell under my observation in Salem, Massachusetts. A member of my congregation, who was a zealous Universalist, resolved that all his children should be brought up in that faith. One of his children, a daughter, intelligent and affectionate, became a Christian. She had, without the knowledge of her father, attended religious meetings, and obtained hope in Christ. She resolved to make a public profession of religion. She announced her feelings and determination to her father, and wished his consent. He became enraged, and gave his refusal in words of profaneness and cursing. He forbade her proceeding any farther, threatening her with banishment from his house, and with his curse, which should follow her to her grave.

Her situation was a trying one. She was young,

—but sixteen years old. She had always loved her father, and she loved him still. Her father's house was all the home she knew, and she feared his anger, and dreaded his curse. But all that she loved on earth was placed on the one hand, and her duty and Savior were placed on the other. She hesitated not one moment. She resolved to do her duty, and leave the consequences to her God.

The sun of that Sabbath, which shone upon her baptism and her public profession of the Savior, had not withdrawn his light before, true to his dreadful vow, that father turned his defenceless daughter from her home, houseless and destitute, into the street, with his curse ringing in her ears. With a heavy heart, she sought the residence of a Christian friend, whose roof afforded her shelter from the tempest — the anger of her unnatural father.

Years passed away, and still her father refused to see her. He passed her in the street without noticing her, and her visits to the home of her youth were by stealth, in the absence of her father, to weep upon the neck of her mother.

Sickness at length subdued his hard heart. Supposing himself to be near his end, he sent for his daughter. She flew to his bedside, and devoted herself to his wants. She wiped away the clammy dampness of disease from his brow, spoke to him in soothing tones, uttering no complaints, and treating him as if he had been one of the tenderest of parents. Her father recovered. But never, from the hour that *daughter* united with the church up to the present

time, has he allowed her to eat with him at the table.

UNIVERSALISM DESTROYS NATURAL AFFECTION.

Can any thing be more plain than that it is destructive to all benevolent and philanthropic efforts? If it were not ruinous to the soul, it should be rejected as an enemy to the best and highest interests of our race.

7. *Ministers who have renounced Universalism have all testified to its immoral Tendency.*

When a minister embraces their sentiments, the fact is announced in capitals in the Universalist periodicals. When one renounces Universalism, but little is generally said of it. No system has lost so many members. No sect, in so short a time, has lost so many advocates. All these have left it on the ground of its licentious and immoral influence.

Paul Dean, of Boston, was colleague with Mr. Murray; and after Mr. Murray's death, was pastor of the First Universalist Society. He was known for many years as one of the most able defenders of Universalism in this country. All the reputation, and standing with the public, which the Universalist ministry have in Boston and its vicinity, they owe to Mr. Dean. In 1828, Mr. Dean left the Universalist denomination, on account of the immoral tendency of its doctrine. Universalists have ever since followed him with unrelenting persecution, because he left them, and spoke openly of the evil tendency of their faith. In conversation with Mr. Dean, I found his experience to agree with my own; only he, having been longer in the ministry, had seen and heard more. Lewis C. Todd, a preacher in Western New York, renounced Universal-

ism. He published his experience of the moral tendency of Universalism. He declared that it "led to infidelity; gave no support to virtue; but, on the contrary, led to a careless and irreligious life." He makes the following statement: "All that I have said of the general effects of the doctrine, has been acknowledged by many candid and honest Universalists. Even PAUL DEAN, of Boston, wrote me that *my statements in relation to the doctrine were correct, and that many of the eastern preachers of the doctrine were becoming convinced of it.*"

Charles Hudson was for many years a preacher of Universalism. His name appears in the "Modern History of Universalism" as a Universalist preacher. The moral tendency of the doctrine drove him from its ministry. The following is his testimony as to the character of the system he once defended. I will only add that Mr. Hudson is now a member of Congress.

"I have already in some degree called your attention to the nature and moral tendency of that scheme of divinity which is so earnestly pressed upon your consideration. I will not at present enlarge upon this subject, but will invite your attention to the practical tendency of that scheme upon society. But here I do not intend to touch upon the moral character of individuals. I shall look at societies and bodies of men. If the representations we have already given of the doctrine be true, we should conclude that it would not build up devout and permanent societies. And how is the fact in this case? We see from the ultra papers that scores of societies have arisen annually in New England for the last ten years. And what is the

present standing of these societies? I cannot speak concerning them all from personal knowledge. But, having had a personal knowledge of the situation, the rise and *fall* of many, I can speak with confidence; and what I shall state is known to all who have any knowledge of the subject. I say then that *more than three fourths* of the societies which have arisen within the last ten years, *have already perished.* I do not mean that they have entirely ceased to be, but that they have relaxed their efforts, and now almost a total indifference prevails. Take this as an example: A society is formed in a certain town, and fifty or sixty male members come forward and unite with the society. Let these men be amply sufficient in worldly means to employ a preacher one half of the time with a fair salary, without taking upon themselves a burden greater than what is borne by the great mass of the people. Now, what is the subsequent history of such a society? For the first year they may have preaching one third of the time, for the second year a quarter, for the third one sixth, and in four or five years they have no preaching at all. Or perhaps they may have a day or two in a year, if a person happens to come along and offer his services. *Now, this is a fair representation of at least nine tenths of the Universalist societies which have been formed for the last ten years.* Some of them may have been a little more prosperous, and others have fallen as much below the example given. I could name scores of societies as examples. Take the country societies as they exist at the present time, and it would require the joint effort, such as they would be disposed to make, of ten or a dozen societies,

to give one preacher constant employ. A much less number might employ a man for a single year; but take five years together, and it would require ten societies. I do not say that this is all that they are able to do, but I say that it is all that they do do, or will do.

"Now, a question naturally arises as to the cause of failure. The friends of modern Universalism tell us, with great assurance, that no cause progresses so fast. This in one sense is true, and it is equally true that no cause dwindles so fast. There is not a sect in the land, of the same numbers and ability, that does so little. Three-fourths of the societies are destitute of a preacher, and take no active means to obtain one. Societies rise like Jonah's gourd, and like that frail plant they wither away. And how is this? To what cause must we ascribe this decline in almost every society? This has sometimes been ascribed to the want of preachers; but the truth has always been that they have had as many preachers as could obtain support. This falling off cannot be ascribed to the operation of any of our laws, for the laws have operated as favorably to them as to others. It cannot be ascribed to the fact that the doctrine was new and unpopular, for this would always operate the most powerfully at first; and if men would break the fetters of popularity, and form themselves into a society, they would not be deterred from pursuing this subject from motives of popularity.

"To what cause, then, is this failure to be ascribed? We say, to the natural tendency of the doctrine. That we may see this tendency, let us give a specimen. In

ociety is formed, and a preacher is employed for a lay. He commences his labors or exercises. His tack upon the Orthodox begins and ends the discourse. It is delivered with that kind of temerity which would make a moderate man shudder; but this asses for great talents with many. His discourse is illed with low wit and severity, which excite laughter in the assembly. The service closes; and what is he impression that is left upon the assembly? They are highly gratified, for the most part, and are eager to engage the preacher again. But what is the moral impression? It is manifestly bad. Every low and unprincipled man will extol it, and some will express their approbation with an oath. 'He is a smart man,' says one. 'He gave it to the Orthodox good,' says another. 'He's no hypocrite,' says a third. 'He expressed my opinion exactly,' says an infidel. 'He don't hold to making a fuss and whining about religion.' Such remarks will be made by the hearers, and you can judge of the moral effect. The preacher comes again, and pursues the same course with the same effect."

The reception which a preacher will meet who pursues an opposite course,—talks to men about their duty, and "maintains that men must be saved by faith and repentance,—that they are accountable beings, and will be dealt with according to their characters,"—Mr. Hudson thus describes:—

"He uses no wit, excites no laughter, and labors to make his hearers virtuous and devout. "But how is this received by the assembly? Why, it produces *more frowns than smiles.* 'I had rather hear the

E. N. Harris was pastor of the Baptist church in Malden. He embraced Universalism; and for a season was very zealous. His counsellor was Mr. Banfield, of Medford, through whose influence Mr. Harris was made a Universalist. Mr. Harris became the preacher to one of the Universalist congregations in Boston. His friend, Mr. Banfield, who led him into Universalism, renounced his faith. Mr. Harris, soon after, followed his example.

Rev. Adin Ballou was many years a zealous and popular Universalist preacher. He has given to the world the following as the result of his experience in the ministry of Universalism:—

"As to the style of my preaching, it had insensibly become remotely imitative of that which distinguished the leading Universalists. Although irony, satire, and witticism, were never pleasing to me, and therefore not indulged in my discourses, yet in other respects I went too far. In following the example of those who use their text by way of accommodation to smite at the prevailing sects, I have since thought I sometimes erred. Those preachers who had become most acceptable to the laity, distinguished themselves by often selecting texts, which, with an ingenious treatment, would enable them to cast the severest reflections upon their opponents with the best grace. If I fell into this practice, it was only to a brief extent, for which I can plead no other excuse, than that it was a fashion of my associates; and therefore difficult wholly to avoid. Otherwise, I retained so much of my early religious feeling, that my discourses were in a good degree characterized by seriousness, moral sentiment,

retribution, are not believers in the essential facts of divine revelation. I have also been present at conventions, and heard discourses preached on ordination occasions, too, which were clearly of an irreligious tendency — discourses which excited more levity than piety, and went more directly to subvert than to build up religious institutions. And these discourses came from those who were gray with age, — who were held up as a model for others! These statements are painful, but are nevertheless true. Now, is it surprising that religious societies should wither and die under such preaching?"

The following persons left the ministry of Universalism at the same time, and have views similar to those expressed by Mr. Hudson: — Edward Turner, — one of the oldest preachers in the order, — P. R. Russell, N. Wright, E. M. Stone, Seth Chandler, David Pickering, Adin Ballou, Lyman Maynard, George Bradburn, and William Morse. All but two of these men are numbered among the preachers of Universalism in the "Modern History."

Among others who have renounced the ministry of Universalism within the last nine years, and who have united in their testimony as to its bad moral tendency, I record the following names: — O. A. Bronson, A. St. Clair, Stephen Cutler, J. Banfield, J. S. Thompson, A. C. Arnold, L. C. Todd, C. Palmer, Mr. Tracy, G. Dean, W. Jackson, E. N. Harris, W. H. Taylor, J. W. Hoskins, F. Mace, N. Chapin, W. Whittaker, and S. Turner.

In relation to each of these men, I should be pleased to make some remarks; but my limits confine me to a few cases.

E. N. Harris was pastor of the Baptist church in Malden. He embraced Universalism; and for a season was very zealous. His counsellor was Mr. Banfield, of Medford, through whose influence Mr. Harris was made a Universalist. Mr. Harris became the preacher to one of the Universalist congregations in Boston. His friend, Mr. Banfield, who led him into Universalism, renounced his faith. Mr. Harris, soon after, followed his example.

Rev. Adin Ballou was many years a zealous and popular Universalist preacher. He has given to the world the following as the result of his experience in the ministry of Universalism:—

"As to the style of my preaching, it had insensibly become remotely imitative of that which distinguished the leading Universalists. Although irony, satire, and witticism, were never pleasing to me, and therefore not indulged in my discourses, yet in other respects I went too far. In following the example of those who use their text by way of accommodation to smite at the prevailing sects, I have since thought I sometimes erred. Those preachers who had become most acceptable to the laity, distinguished themselves by often selecting texts, which, with an ingenious treatment, would enable them to cast the severest reflections upon their opponents with the best grace. If I fell into this practice, it was only to a brief extent, for which I can plead no other excuse, than that it was a fashion of my associates; and therefore difficult wholly to avoid. Otherwise, I retained so much of my early religious feeling, that my discourses were in a good degree characterized by seriousness, moral sentiment,

and moderation; so that, not unfrequently, strangers and opposers would retire from the meeting with the remark that I did not preach like a Universalist.

* * * * * * * *

"Up to this time, I had persuaded myself that my preaching, and that of my brethren, exerted, or tended to exert, a salutary influence upon the moral condition of society, and believed that, when fully proved in its effects, it would vindicate itself against all reproach. I knew well that some, who pretended to propagate Universalism, were too rough and vulgar to do any great good either for their own cause or any other, (and such I could have wished might remain silent;) but, as the clergy generally promised better things, for such I accordingly hoped. Henceforth, however, I perceived so much bitterness indulged, so much labor bestowed to show that the Bible teaches no future judgment or retribution, so much ridicule of the religion of professing Christians, and so much *smart witticism*, even in the preaching of those who were thought most eminent, that I began seriously to doubt whereunto things would grow. Close, moral, practical, and evangelical preaching seemed to be going out of date; and when occasionally I struck into a vein of it, I found that it was evidently unwelcome to those ears which were so much delighted with a different style and subject. This troubled me exceedingly, and was an evil which I knew not how to remedy. I learned that to declaim against the superstition, bigotry, hypocrisy, and fanaticism, of the various religious sects, entertained a certain class of *people very agreeably*, yet without ever producing the

effect to reform them of a single vice. In contemplating the faults and follies of their neighbors, as described by an ingenious speaker, those people would evince the highest gratification; but the certain result I observed always to be, a growing disrelish of all serious religion, and a forgetfulness of their own sinfulness in denouncing that of others. I looked to my elders in the ministry,—those who had it in their power to give tone to the taste and feelings of the laity; but I soon ascertained that they were as far from the mark at which I was aiming, as any of the people. Gradually entering into their secrets, I began to discover some doctrines, practices, and feelings, not altogether consistent with the good opinion I had formed of their moral and intellectual worth. I found them disposed to think lightly of that kind of preaching called *moral*. They would speak of it as a sort of weakly, insipid, tiresome repetition, calculated to reflect no great honor upon the preacher, and to do no essential good to the hearer. *It* would do well enough for those whose gifts fitted them for nothing higher; but *doctrine*, and exposure of the errors of the church, should be mainly attended to, by all who wished to attain celebrity.

"Family devotion, asking blessings, and returning thanks at table, &c. &c., they considered well enough for those who thought proper to observe them, but, on the whole, as idle ceremonies, which could be beneficial neither to God nor man. With regard to a future state of existence, many of them disbelieved that mankind will in *that* state possess any consciousness of *having* previously existed in the present. Some of

them also privately confessed their disbelief in the existence of *angelic beings* of a higher nature than human. These and other similar skepticisms, which from time to time leaked out, occasioned much bitter anxiety for the issue."

Sidney Turner graduated at the Bangor Theological School. To the grief of his friends, he became a Universalist. His conversion was hailed with rapture by the Universalists. His learning, his piety, his honesty, his independence, all were the subjects of high commendation. Mr. Turner settled in Brunswick, Maine, and then, for the first time, learned what was the practical tendency of Universalism. He was appalled at the sight. After continuing in the ministry about three years, he renounced the doctrine publicly, and is doing what he can to undo his labors in the ministry of death.

The manner in which Mr. Turner was received into the ranks of Universalists may be learned from the following article from the "Trumpet:" —

"*Rev. Sidney Turner, the late Convert.* — This gentleman is the clergyman in Maine who has recently renounced the false notions of Orthodox partialism, and embraced, in full, the doctrine of Universalism. Mr. Turner was a regular-bred Orthodox clergyman. He pursued an entire course of studies at the theological seminary in Bangor, Maine, and was one of the beneficiaries of the American Education Society. After this, he was settled over an Orthodox society in Maine, who highly prized his labors, until they learned that he was a Universalist.

"*We cannot help* remarking, in this connection, that

One or two cases I will present. The first I select from "Zion's Watchman," August 10, 1836.

"*Barbarity.* While on a visit to Norwich, Connecticut, a few weeks since, we found a young lady at the house of a friend, from whom we received the following account of the treatment which she had received from her own father; and, from what we learned from others, we believe no one who knows this young lady doubts, in the least, the truth of her statements.

"Her name is ———. She is motherless, and is about twenty-three years of age. Some time in the course of the last year, she commenced attending the Methodist church in the place, and was hopefully converted to God. As soon as her father ascertained that she had connected herself with the Methodist church, he commenced abusing her with profane language, and afterwards threatened to kill her.

"After she had stood out her time of probation, and had been admitted into full connection with the church, her father, as soon as he learned the fact, went into her chamber, and threatened her with instant death, if she did not dissolve her connection with the Methodist church forthwith. He stamped upon the floor, and swore in a most violent rage.

"Having on a pair of thick boots, he then commenced kicking her; and once he hit her in the side, the severe effects of which she has felt now more than four months. He next took his cane, and commenced beating her upon the back and head. With his cane *he struck* her twelve times, and the marks of the blows *were seen* upon her body two months afterwards.

"This man has since been heard to say that he would kill his daughter, if he could find her. When he attends any meeting, he goes to the Universalist."

Another is the case of a lady in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The facts I gathered from her own lips. She became interested in religion, and, in opposition to the wish of her father, left the Universalist meeting, and attended the Orthodox. When she was about to make a profession of religion, her father forbade her doing so. He threatened to disown her, and turn her from his house, if she did not retract. She went forward in the path of duty, and was banished from her father's house on that account. She has a brother who is a Universalist preacher. And when last I saw her, she was in exile from home, bearing the indignation of her father because she loved the Savior.

Another instance fell under my observation in Salem, Massachusetts. A member of my congregation, who was a zealous Universalist, resolved that all his children should be brought up in that faith. One of his children, a daughter, intelligent and affectionate, became a Christian. She had, without the knowledge of her father, attended religious meetings, and obtained hope in Christ. She resolved to make a public profession of religion. She announced her feelings and determination to her father, and wished his consent. He became enraged, and gave his refusal in words of profaneness and cursing. He forbade her proceeding any farther, threatening her with banishment from his house, and with his curse, which should follow her to her grave.

Her situation was a trying one. She was young,

meeting, even though it be to hear the threatenings of the Bible explained away. Indeed, the ministry of Universalism soon relieves men from all trouble in relation to the right interpretation of the Bible, as it prepares the proselyte to reject that holy book as a fable.

Nor does my experience differ from that of others. All who have testified upon this subject have expressed the same views. This I shall show before I close this lecture, both by the testimony of preachers who have renounced Universalism, and of others who still advocate it.

5. *Universalism has no benevolent and liberalizing Tendency.*

Universalists boast of the good moral influence of their faith. We have proved it to be positively demoralizing. They claim for it a philanthropy and a benevolence not found in any system but theirs. The history of its influence will show how well founded this boasting is.

The believers in Universalism deny that God has affixed to his law the penalty of eternal death. They call this a cruel doctrine, — partial and contracting in its effect upon the mind. But no one can deny that those who believe in this sentiment have been pioneers in every benevolent work. Their faith has prompted them to deeds of benevolence to such an extent, that a good cause can hardly be found which they have not originated, and not one which they have not *helped* to sustain.

But what has Universalism done? Nothing.

What benevolent plan has it originated, to ameliorate the condition of men, or promote the interests of our race? What generous, noble, catholic enterprise tells of its liberality and benevolence? Not one. Which of the benevolent institutions, so peculiar to our age, has it ever aided? Not one. What has it done for the heathen? Nothing. Universalists have constantly ridiculed the exertions of those who are engaged in sending or carrying the gospel to the heathen. Neither have they, as a sect, contributed one cent towards the distribution of the Bible among the destitute.

As to the formation of Sabbath schools, Bible classes, as well as temperance societies, they, at the commencement of these enterprises, presented a united and incessant opposition. And this only ceased when opposition became odious to all. After these institutions had won their way to popular favor, and nothing could resist their influence, then the sect, in some measure, adopted these plans, or fell in with the prevailing taste. But this was done altogether in self-defence.

This is illustrated in the history of the temperance cause. From few sources has this reform met with so violent opposition as from the Universalist denomination. When this work began, the Universalist ministers preached against it, and the cause was opposed with great virulence in their periodicals. Some few favored the reformation; but they were compelled to be silent, or only allowed to speak at temperance conventions. Those who would advocate temperance *in their pulpits*, were dismissed.

The fact that many of the Universalist preachers *now* appear to be the friends of temperance, does not change the fact in relation to what they formerly did. It was well understood, among them, that policy required them to enlist in the temperance cause. By so doing, they could associate somewhat with ministers of the gospel, be recognized as such before the world, and, what was more important than all, they would *gain admittance into Orthodox pulpits.* These were the reasons assigned, by the advocates of Universalism, when I was among them, for their efforts in behalf of temperance.

Universalists have done comparatively nothing in favor of education. This is a great, a national object. Next to religion, it has claims upon us all. The Puritans had hardly obtained a shelter for themselves, after they landed upon the frozen shores of New England, before they made provision for the advancement of education. They laid the foundation of their social structure so deep, that it still stands, blessing us, and ready to bless generations to come.

Universalism has existed for half a century. Its friends say it has extended more rapidly than any other sentiment. What, then, has it done for education? I will do Universalism no injustice. I will let its advocates speak to this point. H. Ballou, 2d, says, —

"The present is emphatically an age of popular education. Already has great progress been made in this respect, and a system of measures is coming into *operation,* that promises to elevate the community to a *far higher* degree of culture and intelligence than it

has ever attained. Who are the leaders in this enterprise; ourselves, or others? Who are traversing our country, from state to state, from town to town, rousing the public mind to the subject, and calling forth its energies in the work? We fear that we should be found, on inquiry, to have taken but little active part in the movement, and to have yielded to it, rather than to have carried it forward. Again: the sects around us, the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Baptists, and lastly the Methodists, are entering with all their spirit into the higher departments of education. Their high schools are established in all our large towns; academies are rising up under their patronage on every hand; their colleges, with liberal donations, are multiplying over the country. It needs but little philosophy to perceive what must be the influence of these measures, extending as they do, in their ramifications, through the whole mass of society. To think of measuring the amount of their effects merely by the number of scholars in the several institutions, would be like estimating the quantity of light in an illuminated hall, by the solid contents of flame on the lamps. In both cases, the influence is *abroad* on all the face of the scene, in every nook and corner. To these schools go our young men and women in a constant succession, there to be imbued with new sentiments and tastes; and from these schools, in return, come our teachers, our lecturers, writers, the living host of minds that bear sway in every department of life and thought. What have we done towards providing for the demands that grow out of this state of things? In

New York, we have, indeed, an institution under our patronage, that bids fair to become, ere long, a *bona fide* college — thanks to the life-devoted exertions of a brother whom no apathy could discourage. In New England, we have passed votes, starved two academies to death, and *apotheosized* another into a university, and so sent it up to its home in the clouds. In the farther part of Maine, however, we have a high school, which appears to be doing well; also, an academy or two in Ohio, and — this is all."

The history of this school in New York — the "Clinton Liberal Institute," "which bids fair to become, ere long, a *bona fide* college" — I have already given. This is the only school that Universalists have in any degree sustained. And the note of alarm from its friends, recently sounded, indicates that symptoms of decline already appear in this institution. So much, and no more, Universalists themselves being witnesses, have they done for education since they have existed as a denomination. I need not stop one moment, to convince you that the condition of education, as well as of every thing good, would have been most deplorable, had Universalists settled New England, instead of our Puritan fathers.

It is of no avail to say that the sect is young. It has existed long enough to begin to be benevolent. Other sects have begun their benevolent deeds with the very commencement of their denominational existence. The Moravians began their apparently *hopeless* mission among the rude and benighted Greenlanders, before they numbered, as a denomination, two

thundred persons. If Universalism were a benevolent system, seeking the good of man, not ten years would have passed away without having in operation one systematic scheme of benevolence, intended to benefit our race and world.

Nor is it any excuse to say that Universalists like not the measures of the benevolent societies of the day; for they have the ability to strike out a path of their own.

But the truth is, the doctrine of this sect deals a death-blow at all benevolent plans. It teaches that this earth is just what God intended it should be. Man cannot change its character, if he would. And if God is well pleased with the world as it is, why should Universalists wish to change it?

6. *It dries up Human Affection.*

So far from creating love and good-will to men, Universalism breathes nothing but bitter hostility and hatred to all who differ from its communion. The organs of the sect have long been noted for their scurrility and abuse of all good men. The manner in which they speak of the benevolent operations of the day, the missionary and philanthropic movements of the age, is too familiar to require repetition. Their blasphemous opposition and ridicule of revivals of religion speak the temper of their minds. So powerful is the hatred which Universalism inspires for evangelical religion, that it has destroyed natural affection, and made the parent like the ostrich, who is "hardened against her young as if they were not hers." I have at hand many proofs of this assertion

One or two cases I will present. The first I select from "Zion's Watchman," August 10, 1836.

"*Barbarity.* While on a visit to Norwich, Connecticut, a few weeks since, we found a young lady at the house of a friend, from whom we received the following account of the treatment which she had received from her own father; and, from what we learned from others, we believe no one who knows this young lady doubts, in the least, the truth of her statements.

"Her name is ———. She is motherless, and is about twenty-three years of age. Some time in the course of the last year, she commenced attending the Methodist church in the place, and was hopefully converted to God. As soon as her father ascertained that she had connected herself with the Methodist church, he commenced abusing her with profane language, and afterwards threatened to kill her.

"After she had stood out her time of probation, and had been admitted into full connection with the church, her father, as soon as he learned the fact, went into her chamber, and threatened her with instant death, if she did not dissolve her connection with the Methodist church forthwith. He stamped upon the floor, and swore in a most violent rage.

"Having on a pair of thick boots, he then commenced kicking her; and once he hit her in the side, the severe effects of which she has felt now more than four months. He next took his cane, and commenced beating her upon the back and head. With his cane he struck her twelve times, and the marks of the blows were seen upon her body two months afterwards.

"This man has since been heard to say that he would kill his daughter, if he could find her. When he attends any meeting, he goes to the Universalist."

Another is the case of a lady in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The facts I gathered from her own lips. She became interested in religion, and, in opposition to the wish of her father, left the Universalist meeting, and attended the Orthodox. When she was about to make a profession of religion, her father forbade her doing so. He threatened to disown her, and turn her from his house, if she did not retract. She went forward in the path of duty, and was banished from her father's house on that account. She has a brother who is a Universalist preacher. And when last I saw her, she was in exile from home, bearing the indignation of her father because she loved the Savior.

Another instance fell under my observation in Salem, Massachusetts. A member of my congregation, who was a zealous Universalist, resolved that all his children should be brought up in that faith. One of his children, a daughter, intelligent and affectionate, became a Christian. She had, without the knowledge of her father, attended religious meetings, and obtained hope in Christ. She resolved to make a public profession of religion. She announced her feelings and determination to her father, and wished his consent. He became enraged, and gave his refusal in words of profaneness and cursing. He forbade her proceeding any farther, threatening her with banishment from his house, and with his curse, which should follow her to her grave.

Her situation was a trying one. She was young,

fence of the gospel"? that he was "heart-sick of it, [of his work,] and to be told that" his labors had "contributed much to the rapid spread" of the gospel "had no tendency to remove this sickness"? Would not his name have been handed down to posterity stamped with infamy? Could more be said to show that the doctrine which Paul preached and Universalism are as different as truth and error, evil and good, the theology of heaven and the religion of hell? Of the benevolence of Universalism need more be said? And of the evil moral tendency have the enemies of Universalism said as much as this confession of Mr. Balfour contains?

Mr. Thomas Whittemore says, "The morals of the Universalist would, and must, in the very nature of things, be purer than the morals of those operated upon by different opinions, *were it not that he makes his religion too much a thing of theory and too little a thing of practice. This is the fault of many Universalists.*" (*Guide to Univ.* 283.) That is, Universalism would be a purer system if its moral results were of a different character!

The following graphic description of a Universalist congregation, by the same pen, will at once be recognized:—

"When he [the preacher] goes to conduct the services of public worship, he sees about half as many people as there are pews, scattered over the house, some below, and some in the gallery; no singers, so that the joyful part they perform must be omitted. He begins with a prayer, but there is no feeling; he *knows* not what to say; he labors through it, and it

seems to every one, a dull, long, and unsuitable one. He announces his text, and endeavors to preach, but it is lifeless preaching after all. His congregation have fixed themselves in a situation to suffer the least torture; if in summer, they sleep and nod; if in winter, they bury themselves in their cloaks, and go into a torpid state." (*Guide*, 307.)

Mr. Whittemore asserts that "publicans and harlots rejoiced to find their cause espoused by the Great Teacher sent from God. His doctrine met and satisfied their desires." He adds, "WE LEARN FROM THIS, WHAT CLASS OF PEOPLE IT IS, AMONG WHOM AT THE PRESENT DAY, THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMPARTIAL SAVIOR [UNIVERSALISM] SHALL FLOURISH IN ITS PURITY." (*Notes*, 195.) Publicans and harlots love Universalism; it meets their desires; among them, at the present day, it flourishes in its purity! Has any opponent of Universalism said more?

H. Ballou, 2d. I have in another place presented the testimony of Mr. B. in relation to the character of many Universalist societies, at whose conduct "the moral sense of the community revolts." I cite him further in illustration of this subject. He allows that in many societies religious principle is not to be found, but the "prevailing spirit was opposition." As a consequence of this state of things, he says, "Many who were of no religion themselves would fall into our ranks from no better principle than hostility to the doctrines and practices of the prevailing denominations. They hated *them* with all their hearts. They would join whatever body was most successful against *them*. *They* saw we were making rapid progress;

they liked the warfare well and were loud in their cheering."

In respect to the number of churches, he also says,

"Now, it is an ominous fact, that in a very large proportion of our societies, probably in more than two thirds of our eight or nine hundred, there are no churches, no associations of the kind whatsoever! We have a deep and increasing presentiment that there must be a thorough change of this state of things, and that churches, or something tantamount, (why shun the name?) must be introduced in *all* cases where we form a society, or that its prosperity will not be permanent. At any rate, we cannot conceive of general neglect, without the most disastrous tendencies.

"With respect to the communion of the Lord's supper, we may be told that it is questionable whether this institution was intended as an absolute ordinance, that is, as perpetually and universally obligatory by force of a positive command. We think so too. We have doubts of the existence of ordinances in Christianity; we mean in the usual technical sense of the term."

Concerning the neglect of the religious culture of children, the following confession is made:—

"One of the great faults that marked the course of our measures, till recently, and which may still exist in some parts of the country, was an almost total neglect of the religious education of our children."

The following extract, containing a description of the lax moral discipline among Universalists, and the *character* of the ministry and the converts to Univer-

salism, will confirm much that I have said in this lecture: —

"We have now finished what we had to offer with respect to the purely religious concerns of our denomination; unless we place under this head a few remarks on the importance of a stricter inquiry into the moral character and habitual deportment of those who apply for our fellowship as ministers of the gospel. Perhaps we should also say, — the necessity of a stricter discipline; for we have known one or two cases even in which preachers, condemned on trial for notorious immorality, and disfellowshipped by our conventions in one state, have been received in another state, without the least token of repentance. These instances, however, are so shameful an outrage of all propriety, that the bare mention is the severest admonition that words can inflict. Exceptions — monstrous exceptions as they are, they still are symptoms of some general laxity of discipline. But, passing these by, — prudence as well as duty seems to require that no preacher should be received into our fellowship without the most indubitable proof of his moral integrity; and by this we mean something more than a negative, or the absence of the grosser vices. We want preachers, it is true; but why should we be in haste to lay hands on any man? If he is vain and flighty, if he plunges now into the gospel, and straightway over head into politics, or is crafty and treacherous, or a swaggerer, that knows all things and understands nothing, or a time-server, mad with the itch for present popularity, &c. &c., he will, in all likelihood, prove *a curse to our societies*, if we send him forth; and the

more imposing his talent, the more deeply will both they and ourselves rue the sanction we gave to betray them. We have had a few tolerably plain lessons from experience on this point; may they be sanctified to us! Great circumspection, too, should be used in receiving ministers from other denominations. We are apt to be too eager to secure and proclaim our conquests of this kind. There are cases, unquestionably, in which the reason of one's leaving another sect, is the very reason why we ought to beware of him."

Those who are familiar with the boastings of Universalist ministers, the readiness with which men, ignorant of English grammar, will talk about Sheol, Gehenna, Aion, &c., and the rapidity with which they will repeat the names of the Christian fathers whom they never read, will be interested to learn the secret of this knowledge. Mr. Ballou says,—

"Now, it has sometimes been said, that as a body we are a very *reading* people, more so than other sects in general. Is this boast well founded? True, we read a great many papers, religious and political; we read perhaps the 'Expositor,' and other fugitive publications. Does this make us a *reading* people, in the important sense of the phrase?

"Much has been said on the importance of raising the standard of intellectual and literary qualifications among our ministers. We wish to offer a few remarks on this topic. To us it seems that the first efficient step towards so desirable an object, is, for the ministers frankly to come down, before our denomination, to their real level in this respect, by discarding, every *one of* us, all affectation of attainments that we do not

actually possess: a mortifying task for many, and perhaps for the writer himself! but indispensable, whether we value our reputation among judges, or regard the cause of improvement. It is one of the absurdest things to imagine that we can set up a standard of real excellence, so long as we suffer a fictitious one, the mere show of one, to be maintained with impunity. Down, then, with all pretence; away with all Latin, Greek, and Hebrew parade, by such as are unacquainted with those languages. Expose, lash all affectation of literary research. When a Balfour gives us an 'Inquiry' concerning *Sheol*, let us not forthwith go to quoting Campbell, Jahn, &c., as our own original authorities, while we merely take them from the 'Inquiry.' When a Paige publishes 'Selections from Commentators,' let us not use it for the purpose of referring familiarly to fifty or a hundred commentaries that we have never seen. When we write, let us not take, from other authors, whole paragraphs of references, unsorted, and some of them in languages unknown to us."

The condition of the world, should Universalism ever be the prevalent religion, is graphically set forth in the following supposition. A man who can make such a supposition cannot pray very earnestly for the spread of his faith.

"Suppose that our denomination should continue to grow as now for twenty years to come, and at the end of this period become the most numerous and wealthy sect in our country, having possession of the largest parishes in all the towns, and thus embracing the greater part of the population. But, suppose, at

no such event transpired? They add that Mr. Ballou authorizes them to deny it. Would it not be well for him to wait till I name him? But *what* does he deny? Why not get his denial in his own hand? why not let him speak for himself? Universalists have not yet asked me for the place, nor the minister to whom I refer; but with one voice have they referred it to Roxbury. Now, if such things as those mentioned never took place in Roxbury, and never resulted from the ministry of Mr. Ballou, then has neither any thing to do with them. But if the contrary, then must each make the most of the case. Let the gentleman to whom I do refer, deny the correctness of my statement, and I have it in my power to prove it true.

Mr. Ackley acknowledges that men "profess to believe in the glad tidings of a world's salvation, and at the same time spend the Sabbath at the tavern, the grog-shop, or in other places of wickedness;" that to them "the Sabbath is a weariness instead of delight — the holy sanctuary a prison-house — the Bible a dead letter." (*Univ. Union*, iv. 162.)

Mr. Rayner, of Troy, says, (*Univ. Union*, April, 1837,) "But it is said that Universalism is a very *licentious* doctrine, and that all sorts of vicious characters embrace it, and are found in its ranks. Here, my brethren, to a certain extent, we must plead guilty, or at least, acknowledge our misfortune. Among the professors of the principles of Universalism, there are indeed some unworthy characters; men of corrupt minds, and vicious tempers and habits."

He then adds, "*Universalists* of Troy, awake! arise!

To the religious people of that city he was in the habit of saying that he thought the Universalism of Mr. Ballou, Balfour, and Whittemore, to be more baneful than Kneelandism, [atheism;] and he would sooner advocate the latter than the former. And yet then, and now, he countenanced that Universalism, exchanged with its advocates, and fellowshipped them in all things.

A Universalist preacher, who stands at the head of the denomination, was settled seventeen years in the vicinity of Boston. He had under his charge the largest and best Universalist society. He was very sick, and supposed to be in a consumption. He told me that the moral condition of his society and the moral results of his preaching made him sick, and almost carried him to his grave. He felt that he had done no good; that his ministry had been the source of much evil, besides wasting the long period of time that he had been settled. Nearly every man who was in the society when he was settled died during his ministry. And nearly every one that died, was AN ATHEIST, A DEIST, OR A DRUNKARD. He could not remain. He left his charge, and settled over a small congregation, resolved to change his style of preaching, expecting to see a different result. Vain hope, while Universalism is preached!

When I related this circumstance in my lectures, as I delivered them, Universalists first pronounced this a falsehood, and then said that I referred to Roxbury, and that the minister was H. Ballou, 2d. But *how does it happen* that they have found a place, if

no such event transpired? They add that Mr. Ballou authorizes them to deny it. Would it not be well for him to wait till I name him? But *what* does he deny? Why not get his denial in his own hand? why not let him speak for himself? Universalists have not yet asked me for the place, nor the minister to whom I refer; but with one voice have they referred it to Roxbury. Now, if such things as those mentioned never took place in Roxbury, and never resulted from the ministry of Mr. Ballou, then has neither any thing to do with them. But if the contrary, then must each make the most of the case. Let the gentleman to whom I do refer, deny the correctness of my statement, and I have it in my power to prove it true.

Mr. Ackley acknowledges that men "profess to believe in the glad tidings of a world's salvation, and at the same time spend the Sabbath at the tavern, the grog-shop, or in other places of wickedness;" that to them "the Sabbath is a weariness instead of delight — the holy sanctuary a prison-house — the Bible a dead letter." (*Univ. Union*, iv. 162.)

Mr. Rayner, of Troy, says, (*Univ. Union*, April, 1837,) "But it is said that Universalism is a very *licentious* doctrine, and that all sorts of vicious characters embrace it, and are found in its ranks. Here, my brethren, to a certain extent, we must plead guilty, or at least, acknowledge our misfortune. Among the professors of the principles of Universalism, there are indeed some unworthy characters; men of corrupt minds, and vicious tempers and habits."

He then adds, "Universalists of Troy, awake! arise!

shake yourselves from your *lethargy*—ah, and from other things, *worse than a lethargy.*"

Mr. L. C. Browne says, "A Universalist formerly, in the judgment of the world, was a good-humored, swearing, laughing, joking, Bible-neglecting, Sabbath-disregarding, accommodating, neighborly sort of a being, that had owned and lost Ballou on the Atonement, heard three Universalist sermons, and had argued all the Orthodox out of all the bar-rooms in town." (*Univ. Union*, iv. 166.)

And Mr. Browne will not dare dispute the correctness of this judgment of the world as to what a Universalist was supposed to be. And the world is still competent to judge of the character of Universalists of the present day. Their judgment will be as correct now as formerly. Universalists thus allow what was once the character of their associates. From the nature of the case, it must always be the same. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Mr. Clarke, settled for two years in Calais, Maine, left his society because the results of his preaching were manifestly immoral. Infidelity and licentiousness were the prevailing sins. He could not stem the torrent. He would not increase it. He therefore left the place.

Dunbar B. Harris, a Universalist preacher, confessed, in a stage-coach, to a number of gentlemen of unquestionable veracity, that my statements in relation to the *moral results of his* faith were true. He said he

had heard my lecture upon the moral tendency of Universalism, and he knew the facts to be as I represented. He said the Universalist ministry all knew them to be true, and he was glad they were exposed; for they ought to be.

A few months ago, I met with a Universalist minister. He said to me, "Mr. S., you have told the truth about us. I know it is true, what you have stated." "Why, then," I asked, "do you not leave such a ministry?" He replied, "I cannot resist the force of the Universalist argument. I cannot believe Orthodoxy, though I tremble at the practical tendency of my faith." "Why, then," I inquired, "do you not lift up your voice against these crying sins? Why not speak, and bear testimony to the results of your faith?" "I dare not do it," was the answer. "I should be sacrificed at once, and my family would suffer." Such is the feeling in many minds.

The long-continued and violent assault upon myself was designed as much to influence the dissatisfied in their own borders, as to ruin me. Among the Universalist ministry, there are many persons dissatisfied at the moral results of Universalism, who fear to make an open complaint. And having had some solemn lessons read to them by those of independent minds, Universalists wish to make an example of me, to deter others.

Indeed, it is not in my power to record all that Universalist ministers have confessed in relation to the tendency of their faith. Much is too indelicate to be written. And on this account the most dreadful feature of the practical tendency of this system must be unwritten.

Universalists have pointed to Gloucester, Massachusetts, as a town in which the practical results of their faith appear. When any one calls Universalism an immoral system, they say, "Look to Gloucester; there our faith was first planted; and by its results there we will be judged."

I am very happy to bear testimony to the excellent moral and amiable character of many who call themselves Universalists in Gloucester. But nearly all of them formed their habits under a different influence; and others would have been as amiable if they had never embraced Universalism.

But, notwithstanding this, if I wished to prove the tendency of Universalism to be all that I have described it, I know of no place in New England that I would so soon select in proof of my statements as Gloucester. Charles Spear, who was settled over the society at Sandy Bay, a part of Gloucester, made to me, frequently, the most mournful confessions of the character of those who composed his society. Intemperance, profanity, Sabbath-breaking, licentiousness, abounded. And he informed me, in the presence of witnesses, that so dissolute were the people, that no person thought of being married till one of the parties was compelled to be. Nearly all the marriages he celebrated, he said, were of this description.

UNIVERSALISM CONTAINS THE ELEMENTS OF ITS OWN RUIN.

Its principles of interpretation destroy it. They *deny future bliss,* destroy the dwelling-place of the

righteous in the coming world, and blot out not only future life, but even the existence of God.

Societies formed have no religious principle. Opposition is their uniting bond, and hostility to religion their rallying cry. Many societies are thus created: A number of men unite and form a Universalist society. A subscription paper is circulated and money raised to sustain preaching. The fact that a society has been formed is announced in a Universalist paper, accompanied with the remark, that "the cause is in the highest state of prosperity" in that place. The money raised is "preached out," and the society suspends animation. Again it starts, and again the prosperity of Universalism in that place is announced to the public; and then again it pauses. At length it gathers energy enough to build a house. The prosperity of the cause is complete in that place, and the society dies with the exertion. There are scores of societies in the country whose history is thus given. They meet for opposition; and well does Mr. Ballou say of them, "And even they, grown weary in time of seeing the same battles fought over and over, will gradually desert, unless new objects of attack be sought out, one after another, until every thing, sacred as well as profane, true as well as false, has been refuted; and then, dissolution *must* come, for there is no more to do."

A minister settled over a Universalist congregation learns that he has a motley assemblage to please. Among them he finds much speculation, little piety, and no prayers. Many will be found who hate the *Orthodox* with a perfect hatred, but few who have

any fixed religious principle. These will be hearty in any measure that will put down superstition, as they call religion; who attend meeting when they please, and give their minister to understand, if reproved, that they are not priest-ridden. Many zealous Universalists soon learn out, and lose all interest in the services, or abandon the meeting altogether.

The late pastor of the Callowhill Street Universalist Society thus confirms my statements:—"The house in which I preach accommodates two or three different congregations, not indeed at the same time. But the number of people who frequently attend is sufficient to constitute two or three congregations, if all could be induced to attend constantly. Some attend say once in four weeks, some once in twelve, some once or twice a year, and some when a celebrated brother visits us. Who can preach under the conviction that those who hear will not come again within four or six weeks? Yet under such discouraging circumstances do Universalist ministers have to discourse in Philadelphia." Again he says, "After an existence of sixteen years, our society is not what its friends desire. Our places of worship were as well filled ten years ago as now; those they deemed their right-hand men have deserted from their ranks, or abandoned their posts in the citadel of truth, for the barbarous habit of spending their Sundays in rambling for recreation, or lounging and loitering for ease." (*Univ. Union*, iv. 342.) So is it every where.

A writer in the "Trumpet" says, "In Philadelphia, as is generally known, the cause of Universalism has *long been stationary* — or rather, it has made no per-

ceptible progress; it has, meanwhile, been blessed with able, and active, and highly esteemed ministers—Bs. A. C. Thomas and S. W. Fuller, with two handsome and capacious meeting-houses also, in pleasant and central situations. Yet, withal, it has remained about where it was many years ago."

UNIVERSALISM LEADS TO SUICIDE.

Its doctrines, when they have a practical influence upon the heart, must lead to self-destruction. They make it unnecessary and unwise for us to keep an existence which is so full of woe, and which is the only barrier to perfect and endless felicity. It must be folly and madness to continue in this life of disappointment and misery, when, by a self-inflicted death, a man may

> "end
> The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks
> That flesh is heir to."

Remove from men the dread of something after death, and no one would

> "bear the whips and scorns of time,
> The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
> The insolence of office, and the spurns
> That patient merit of the unworthy takes;
> When he himself might his quietus make
> With a bare bodkin."

But if it be a true doctrine, as Universalism maintains, that there can be no ills beyond death, that *the soul* arises up from the midst of the deepest

degradation, of sins of the blackest dye, into infinite happiness, then self-destruction must be a duty. By it we ascend instantly from the condition of a down-trodden, suffering, sinful mortal, to that of a glorious, exalted, immortal spirit.

Many have acted on these principles. A few cases I will mention.

A man in the city of Utica, New York, became weary of life, and resolved to end it. He said he thought God did not wish to have him live any longer on earth, he made him so miserable; and he purchased a quantity of laudanum with which to take his life. He swallowed the poison, but medical aid was at hand, and his plans were defeated.

Soon after this, he married; but his domestic relations were not happy. He resolved now to leave the world. He purchased two pistols, picked the flints, and loaded them with care. He then sent for his minister, the Universalist preacher in Utica, to visit him. The preacher came, bringing an associate with him. To his minister he said, "Where shall I go when I die?" "To heaven," was the reply. "Have I any thing to fear beyond death?" "Nothing," was the response. "So I believe. I am tired of this world, and mean to seek a better." He laid his hands upon his pistols, and, as he raised them, his spiritual guides took the alarm. "Stop," cried one of them, "stop; there may be a hell, after all." The desperate man gave him a look of withering indignation, and exclaimed, "You do not believe the doctrine you preach. You are a deceiver. But I believe that all men will be happy at death. I will convince you

that I thus believe." He raised both pistols to his head; they flashed in the pan, and immediately he was secured. Before they parted, he informed his spiritual guides that he had done with them; that now he had an opportunity to judge of their sincerity.

Universalists have never denied the facts stated above. They attempt to traduce the character of the man. But they dare not deny the statement. My authority is an elder in the Presbyterian church, a man well known to the religious world. He was present in the session of the church in Utica, and heard the individual make the statement I have recorded.

Cyrus C. Crawford, of Plymouth, New Hampshire, an intelligent and respected young man, during the last winter, was drawn away by temptation, and involved in the crime of passing counterfeit money. He was soon arrested and imprisoned, and while awaiting his trial he committed suicide. Before this last act of violence, he wrote a letter of consolation to his mother.

"In that letter he said to his mother, in substance, '*I have concluded that the best way to get out of this scrape, is to leave this world of trouble. It is appointed to man once to die, and he may as well die when life becomes a burden to him.*' *He expressed an unwavering confidence, that a few moments would introduce him to a world where there will be no trouble.* And surely, if we grant his premises, we must admit his conclusion. If Universalism be true, he must have been foolish indeed to have lived and endured the ignominy that awaited him. Who would

not have preferred a mansion in heaven, to a berth in the state prison?" He was an ardent lover of the "Trumpet," and its contents nerved him for the fatal deed. No one will say that young Crawford did not die full in the faith.

Jonathan Cilley, who was killed by Mr. Graves, of Kentucky, in a duel, was in conversation with a pious lady in Washington the night before he was shot. He confessed that, with the religious views that the lady entertained, he should be deterred from fighting the duel. But, as a Universalist, he had nothing to fear; if he shot his antagonist, the world would justify him; but if he was killed, his soul would immediately ascend to heaven. I have already alluded to Mr. Richards, of Philadelphia, who committed suicide. Mr. Basset, of Dedham, should also be mentioned. Both of these men were popular preachers of Universalism.

We have thus proved that Universalism tends to self-destruction; and the reason that so few, comparatively, commit suicide, is found in the fact that there are very few confirmed Universalists in the world.

UNIVERSALISM IS ON THE WANE.

To read a Universalist periodical, one would suppose that Universalism was overrunning the country with gigantic strides, and that all the ministers of other denominations were turning to their faith. But when one looks at the matter as it is, the reverse is found to be the fact. The habit of boasting into which Universalists have fallen is notorious. But

little reliance can be placed upon statements found in their periodicals, in respect to the prosperity of their cause; and I have conversed with Universalists who depend upon Universalist papers for their information, who did not know that any Universalist society had run down, or that any preacher, except myself, had renounced Universalism.

But take any place in which Universalism has existed six years, and draw a circle around it of ten miles, and you will find Universalism to be less flourishing than at its commencement.

Let me begin at Boston. There are now in the city proper *three* Universalist meeting-houses. There was that number *fifteen years ago*. Has Universalism increased even with the increase of population? Am I told that a new house in Warren Street was erected two or three years ago? True. And the Third Universalist Society, about the same time, was transferred to another denomination, and took with it the most elegant house of worship the Universalists have ever erected. About the same time, the Purchase Street Universalist Society ran down, its minister renounced Universalism, and its place of worship was transferred to the infidels. When the Warren Street Universalists' house was built, a marble slab was placed in front, informing the passer-by that it was the *Fifth* Universalist meeting-house. But there was no *Third* Universalist meeting-house in Boston at that time, and has been none since. Was not this intended to deceive? Does it not deceive? Was there not an unwillingness to have the true condition of Universalism in Boston known? This is but a single illus-

tration of the fact that from Universalists themselves you cannot learn the real prosperity of their cause. At the present time, Universalists have three meeting-houses in the city of Boston, and a small one, with a feeble society, in South Boston; and this is the amount of Universalist organization in the head-quarters of Universalism, after an existence of forty-nine years. In 1810, the Universalists had as many churches in Boston as the Orthodox Congregationalists. Now, the Orthodox, in the city proper, have twelve churches, besides churches at South and East Boston. The preachers of Universalism make their deluded followers believe that Orthodoxy is running down, and Universalism is sweeping all before it; while the truth is, that Universalists had as many places of worship in the city proper fifteen years ago, as they have this day.

But there is one feature in the present aspect of Universalism in Boston that will be interesting to the friends of truth. I have already stated that Hosea Ballou is the father of modern Universalism. Mr. Ballou was installed over the Second Universalist Society in Boston in December, 1817. His system was not fully developed till after that period. A quarter of a century has passed away since ultra-Universalism was formed. Its author is now reaping the harvest he has sowed. Not only has the society dwindled on his hands till its dissolution was threatened, but it has deliberately, and we believe forever, against Mr. Ballou's most strenuous efforts, *ejected ultra-Universalism from its birthplace.*

In opposition to Mr. Ballou's wishes, a colleague has

been chosen by the society. The gentleman chosen is not an ultra-Universalist. He is not a member of the denomination of Universalists. He is a Unitarian. His election was opposed by Mr. Ballou and his friends on that ground. He was chosen by a large majority. And virtually the Second Universalist meeting-house has passed out of the hands of the Universalist denomination. Mr. Ballou and his friends are preparing to leave the place in which he has preached so long, and begin again to build up ultra-Universalism. And when the enterprise is commenced, it will be trumpeted abroad that Universalism is so prosperous in Boston, that another society has been formed! So much flourishes Universalism in Boston.

No man acquainted with Universalism will pretend that it is on the increase in the vicinity of Boston. In some places new societies are formed, but these do not keep the number whole. Not as many have been formed within six years as have suspended preaching. So far from keeping up with the increase of population, in almost all the older societies there are manifestations of decline. In many places, while other churches are enlarged to keep up with the increase of population, Universalists contract their houses to meet the wants of their congregations.

Take Cambridgeport as an illustration. The Universalist meeting-house was built more than twenty years ago. Thomas Whittemore was for many years pastor of the society. He still resides in that place, and throws the influence of his "Trumpet" and his *wealth* in favor of Universalism. At the time of his

settlement, Cambridgeport was a small place. There were in it a small Unitarian and a feeble Baptist church.

The Baptists have enlarged their house two or three times. The Orthodox Congregationalists have built a house which they have once enlarged. And recently, for want of room, the church have set off a new body. But the Universalist society has always been small. Under Mr. Whittemore it nearly ran out. And to accommodate the house to the congregation, a floor has been thrown across the gallery, and the upper part is used for the place of meeting. Mr. Whittemore gives the following account of this alteration: —

"In the summer of 1839, the Universalist society in Cambridgeport proceeded to alter their meeting-house. The principal object was to provide a vestry for the use of the Sunday school. The house having very high posts, so that there was a distance of nearly thirty feet from the floor to the ceiling, a new floor was laid on a level with the original gallery, on which were placed eighty-six pews, besides the singing gallery. The old house had ninety pews on the lower floor, so that the reader will see that the present arrangements will accommodate about the same number of people as could have been accommodated on the lower floor of the former arrangement. To be sure, we have lost the old galleries, which the society never needed until lately; but such has been its late increase, we now stand much in need of them. The house was altered to gain the lower part for a vestry, and to modernize and beautify it,

the which cost three thousand dollars. The same alteration in principle has been made in Park Street and Essex Street meeting-houses, (both Orthodox,) in this city, and many of the old *high* meeting-houses in the country." In this statement are several errors.

1. "The Universalist *society* in Cambridgeport" did *not* alter their meeting-house; they were unable to do it. To save the cause from utter ruin, Mr. Whittemore and several persons secured the house, and made the alterations, agreeing simply to afford the Universalist society a place of worship. The Universalist society do not own the place of meeting; they have no right there, other than that which they secure by hiring a pew by the year. Mr. W. and his associates can call whom they please to preach, pay him what they please, and, after the expenses of the society are paid, they can do what they please with the surplus.

2. "The present arrangements will" NOT "accommodate about the same number of people." Eighty-six pews will not hold as many as ninety, especially when they are smaller ones. And then a large gallery has been removed, which would hold a third as many as the floor of the house.

3. "The same alteration in principle has" not "been made in Park Street and Essex Street churches" in Boston. Those churches contain each more pews on the floor than before the alteration; and, in each case, the galleries have not only been retained, but enlarged.

Twenty years ago, Cambridgeport contained not *one half* its present number of inhabitants. Then

the Universalists owned their house of worship. Their society is still feeble. Their house has passed out of their hands. And, though they have secured to them a place of meeting, it is but two thirds the size of the house they occupied twenty years ago, when the town contained not one half its present population. Is this an evidence of the triumphs of Universalism in this place?

But this is only a sample. In many other places the same alteration has been made, to accommodate the congregation. And, in many towns, Universalists have wrested houses of worship and funds from other sects, and, when the oppressed society have, at great sacrifice and toil, secured another place of worship, the Universalists have closed theirs, and suspended their meetings; thus presenting the motive which prompted them to action.

It would not be possible for me to present a history of the Universalist societies which have run down in this country, without swelling my lectures to an unwarranted size. To show that Universalism is really on the wane, I present a small amount of the proof I have at hand.

In Oxford, Massachusetts, one of the oldest Universalist societies was formed. It was large, and owned a large meeting-house. The society ran down entirely, some years ago, and the meeting-house was sold to the Methodists. In Boston, the Third Universalist Society, with their place of worship, has been transferred to the Unitarians; and the Purchase Street Society was transferred to the infidels. In Nantucket, the Universalist society ran down, and

their meeting-house was converted into a lyceum. In Pawtucket, the Universalists had a large and elegant meeting-house. They flourished for a time, then faded, and their meeting-house was sold to the Baptists. After a death of some years, Universalism has started again, and a *very* small house has been erected. But, without any allusion to the existence and failure of the first society, the public are informed that Universalism is spreading very rapidly in Pawtucket, and the erection of this small house is adduced in proof of it. In Woburn, Massachusetts, the society has expired, and its place of meeting sold for a town house. In Milford, the society is nearly extinct. Its meeting-house is opened to atheists, and used for dramatic and comic exhibitions when desired. Though once one of the strong societies of Universalists, it is now nearly or quite dead. In Taunton, the Universalists had a settled preacher and a large house. The society is extinct, the minister gone, and the house sold to the Orthodox. The editor of the "Trumpet" makes the following lamentation over this place: —

"*Taunton, Massachusetts.* Our spiritual Zion in Taunton has been, for a few years, in a sad condition. The purchase of the old meeting-house proved to be a very unfortunate measure; the friends of our cause were at last obliged to abandon it; and they have been disconsolate and afflicted; they have hung their harps upon the willows."

In Dorchester, Saugus, Western, Topsfield, Randolph, East Bridgewater, societies have been formed, *preaching* sustained for a season, and then the socie-

ties have expired. So, also, in Manchester, Amesbury, East Bradford, Westminster, and Barnardston. Rev. Parsons Cooke says, in relation to Ware, Massachusetts, "When we first went to that place, [Ware,] nearly a majority of the parish, then just formed, were Universalists. And, during the *ten years* we were on the ground, we had the satisfaction to see the DISSOLUTION OF TWO SUCCESSIVE ORGANIZATIONS of a Universalist society, in spite of the *personal efforts* of *the trumpeter himself*, who occasionally made the journey of seventy miles, to raise the wind, and carry back trumpet-tongued reports of the wonders he was doing." In many other places in Massachusetts, too numerous to recite, Universalist societies have been formed with a flourish of trumpets, lived for a season, and then expired.

The same is true of Connecticut. Since the year 1830, societies have been formed in the following places; and, as we announce them, we will mention their present condition: —

In New Haven, two societies have been formed since the time we have mentioned, and three ministers regularly settled. The ministers have all departed, and both of the societies numbered among the things that were. In Woodbridge, a society was formed, and regular preaching secured. Here, also, the end is come. Norwalk and Monroe have shared the same fate. Newtown, Southbury, and Cheshire, were visited, for a season, with the light of Universalism; but that light has now become darkness. In Tolland, a Universalist society was *regularly organized*, — in Ellington, in Glastenbury,

in Wolcottville, in Granby, in Somers, in Warehouse Point, in Woodstock, in Southington, and Meriden. In each of these places, the services of a Universalist minister were secured, a portion of the time. But all are hushed in that repose which knows no awakening.

In Barkhamstead, a house was built; and, at the dedication, the services of Mr. Ballou, of Boston, were secured, at great expense; a minister was settled. The society has since run down, and the house is closed.

In Granby, a Universalist society was formed, the old Baptist meeting-house obtained, and a minister settled. The minister, many years since, removed, and the society is not.

In New London, a society was formed under auspicious circumstances. A minister was settled, and all Universalists thought that the cause was permanently established in New London. But, in an hour when it was least expected, the cause expired, and, like the baseless fabric of a vision, has left not a wreck behind.

Time would fail me to speak of Collinsville, Manchester, and Durham, — of Union and West Stafford, — of Thompson, Sharon, and Fairfield, and many other places, in which Universalists may now stand, and contemplate what Gamaliel meant, when he said, "If this work be of men, it will come to nought."

The same history, substantially, may be given of the Universalist societies in New York, Maine, and New Hampshire.

In all parts of New Hampshire may be seen houses *built* by Universalists, and closed, or sold to other

denominations. The same is true of the state of Maine. And all admit the astonishing decrease of Universalism in the state of New York. The Universalist periodicals have, for some time, been discussing the cause, thus admitting the fact. In the Magazine and Advocate, June 12, 1841, S. R. Smith, one of the leading Universalist preachers in New York, publishes a long article, assigning the reasons for the decline of Universalism. In it, he says, "It is generally conceded that Universalism is really and constantly on the decline, or, at least, in a low and languishing condition, in all that region." He regrets that these representations have been made, because they "make the inactive and languishing sink still lower under the weight of public opinion."

Mr. Grosh says, (*Mag.* v. 86,) "The societies of Universalists in this region are, many of them, destitute of stated preaching — and many of them seldom enjoy even occasional preaching. This need not be, unless they *love* to have it so. If these societies will raise a fund for the support of preaching, and inform us of their capabilities, we can occasionally send them a supply — perhaps a *stated* supply."

The editors of Universalist papers who published the fact that Universalism was on the decline, were censured for so doing. One of them thus defends himself: —

"*Universalism in Western New York.* — Some dissatisfaction exists among some of our good brethren in the section through which I travelled lately, in regard to various articles published in this paper, *representing the cause* there as in a declining state

Not knowing what was the state of affairs there some time ago, my observations did not enable me to judge whether any decline existed or not. The places languid now, may always have been languid—those where our friends are numerous and active, may now be less so than formerly. I can only say, that in many places a want of energy does exist, as well as in this region, and that there are too many who are professed Universalists, who manifest it not by any action, not even by attendance on public worship in their neighborhoods. Some whole societies, that might have preaching statedly, as well as not, have none even occasionally, except *at the expense of the preacher!* These things exist there, as well as here, though it gives an honest and warm-hearted Universalist the heartache to mention them." (*Mag. and Adv.* July 5, 1838.)

I cannot leave this description of Universalism in Western New York, without allowing one of its advocates to speak of the manner in which those societies which remain, support their ministers. The following is from the pen of L. C. Brown, and published in the *Univ. Union*, April, 1837.

A Week, from the Diary of a Country Clergyman.—"Monday morning. Arose, much fatigued with the labors of the day previous, having travelled fifteen miles in the morning, preached three discourses, and returned home at evening. Found my family out of wood, meat and flour. Went to Br. Johnson's, three miles, for wood; but found he could bring none till *sleighing*. Went to Br. Thompson's for meat. &c.

said every pound of pork he had to spare would bring him the *cash* — gave me a belly piece, at a shilling a pound, and said it must go on his subscription. Returned home at sunset. Went in the evening to the mill for flour — purchased a barrel at eleven dollars, promising to pay at the end of next quarter.

"Tuesday. Wife sick, in consequence of cold house and no wood — hired girl, a Methodist, gone to camp-meeting. Spent the day in nursing wife and taking care of children. Toward evening, Br. Robinson brought a load of green beech limbs, and ordered a dollar credited on his subscription.

"Wednesday. Called to attend a funeral, at two o'clock, P. M. Ran till noon in search of a conveyance. Procured a horse of Br. Wilson, a carriage of Br. Jilson, and wagon of Br. Simpson. Rode twelve miles over hubs — preached in a barn, the house being too small to accommodate — received the thanks of the family and a bushel of apples — rode home in the rain, and paid ten shillings for conveyance. Called at the post-office — met Owen Gibbon, the infidel, who rallied me about priestcraft, and a priest-ridden people, and gave some hints respecting the indolence and luxury of the clergy, 'living upon the fat of the land,' &c.

"Thursday. Sick of a cold, from yesterday's exposure — went to bed, after breakfast, and took a boneset sodorific.

"Friday. Rose much better — did up morning chores, and took up Bible to look out texts for Sunday. Interrupted by a friend who called to request *my attendance at* a wedding in the evening ten miles

distant. Put down book, and went again to seek conveyance — procured the same as on Wednesday at the same price. Went to wedding — married parties — received a five franc piece from the hand of groomsman, with the compliments of groom, and returned in the dark and through a snow-storm.

"Saturday. Cut wood all the forenoon, to last over Sunday. Br. Todd called to labor me for not visiting more in my societies. Looked out texts after dinner, and started at two o'clock, for S., eighteen miles off, to spend the Sabbath, and prepared sermons on the way.

"Sunday. Day stormy. Preached three discourses to thin audiences, in three different neighborhoods — went to bed with a severe headache, resolving to travel westward in the spring, in search of a location. APOLLOS."

To this should be appended the following from the Magazine and Advocate:—

A. A. Davis says, "On the 19th I visited the Shakers at Union Village, and found Rev. A. Carder (who was formerly a Universalist preacher) among those, dressed out in Shaker uniform, with a straight coat, and broad-brimmed hat. I inquired of him whether he believed, as he used to, in the salvation of all men. He said he did. I inquired the cause of his joining the Shakers: He said, that among them, *he could have three good meals regularly every day.*

"Now, let no one laugh because the aforesaid Rev. A. Carder had a little respect for his stomach. Men *cannot* live on the wind; and, as preachers are made

of flesh and blood, they must have something to eat."

I have already said that Universalism cannot live at the south; not for want of material out of which to form societies, but for want of quickening principle in Universalism to combine these elements into the forms of an efficient life. Irreligious men at the south wish no cloak; and the idea that the Bible countenances Universalism is too absurd for men who reflect to entertain one moment.

Great efforts have been made to establish Universalist societies at the south, but with little success. At Baltimore, for a time, Universalism seemed to flourish. An expensive house was built, and it was triumphantly asserted that the doctrine was permanently established there. But in a short time, the house was sold under the hammer; and Universalism has a name in Baltimore, but this is all.

At Charleston, South Carolina, and Richmond, Virginia, Universalists have an organization, and perhaps in two or three places besides. But in all of them, the societies are feeble and expiring.

Such is Universalism in America.

UNIVERSALISM IN EUROPE.

Let us now turn to Europe, the land of its birth, and learn the prosperity of Universalism across the Atlantic.

Universalists, as a distinct denomination, began with James Relly, in England, who, before his avowal of faith in the salvation of all men, was a member of *Mr. Whitefield's* Connection. It was by attending the preaching of this man, that John Murray was converted

to Universalism. The influence that Mr. Relly must have exerted in England, may be learned from the following description of his congregation and place of worship, given by Mr. Murray:—

"Mr. Relly had changed his place of worship, and we were astonished to observe a striking proof of the falsehood of those reports, which had reached us; no coaches thronged the street, nor surrounded the door of this meeting-house; there was no vestige of grandeur, either within or without. The house had formerly been occupied by Quakers; there were no seats, save a few benches; and the pulpit was framed of a few rough boards, over which no plane had ever passed. The audience corresponded with the house; they did not appear very religious; that is, they were not melancholy; and I therefore suspected they had not much piety." (*Life of Murray*, 137.)

But whatever of a denominational character Universalism may have had in England, for that it is indebted to Elhanan Winchester, of America. He was settled in Philadelphia. "His society in Philadelphia prospered under his ministry for about six years; when, in the earlier part of 1787, the congregation was, one Sabbath, struck with surprise to hear him announce that, having long felt it his duty to visit England, he had now determined to take his passage thither immediately. It was in vain for his friends to entreat or to expostulate; and though perhaps offended at the suddenness of his departure, they made such provision for his voyage as the time would permit. In forty-eight hours after he had given them notice, *he sailed*, with his wife, in a vessel bound to Lon-
don." (*Mod. Hist.* 284.)

In 1788, Mr. Winchester preached in London with very great success. Crowds attended his ministry, and the largest place his friends could procure would not accommodate all who came to hear. "He frequently visited Chatham, Birmingham, Wisbeach, and Fleet, a place in Lincolnshire, and preached in nearly all the meeting-houses of the *General* Baptists in the county of Kent. Several dissenting preachers openly professed the doctrine of universal restoration; and some who discountenanced it, patronized him, as he retained many of the notions, and considerable of the language, of the lower sects." (*Mod. Hist.* 287.)

So great was his success that the friends of virtue and religion were alarmed. None doubted but Universalism was to be the prevailing heresy of the land. What the result would have been had Mr. Winchester remained in England, no one can predict. He relieved those who feared the result of his labors, and put an end to the spread of Universalism in England, in the following manner:—"Mr. Winchester was in the height of his influence, when, on the 1st of May, 1794, his friends were alarmed by word from his wife, that he was missing, and that she feared some evil had befallen him. The next morning, advertisements were inserted in the papers, and a search made, with no success. A number of his friends assembled at his house to condole with Mrs. Winchester, when one of them received a letter from Winchester himself, revealing, as the cause of his flight, a long series of intolerable abuse from the desperate temper of his own wife, which had at length put his life in danger, and *driven him* wounded from home. This letter was

read in Mrs. Winchester's hearing, who, after some prevarication, confessed the facts alleged." (*Mod. Hist.* 287.)

Such was the beginning of the denominational existence of Universalism in England; such the character of its founder; and before his death, ten or twelve societies were formed in England. A half a century has passed away, and what now is the condition of Universalism in that country? Let Universalists answer. Mr. Sawyer says, —

"We regret that we have it not in our power to give a cheering account of the condition of our Universalist *societies* in Great Britain; but, within the last twenty or thirty years, they seem to have been far from prosperous. The greater part of those in England have been merged in the Unitarians, and are therefore reckoned with them. Such are Mr. Winchester's society in London, the two societies in Portsmouth, the one in Plymouth, and one in Fareham. Of Mr. Relly's old society in London, we have heard and known nothing since 1820. It has probably become quite extinct, or is so dwindled away as to be scarcely deserving of notice. The societies at Bishopstone, Shaftesbury, Westbury, and Whitehaven, were always small bodies; and, since the removal of Mr. William Upjohn, who, it is said, was their principal speaker, and who came to the United States in 1829 or 1830, they have been mostly without a pastor, and have, without doubt, much declined. But of their actual condition at this moment we have no definite information. WE KNOW, INDEED, OF BUT ONE FLOURISHING SOCIETY IN ENGLAND AT THE PRESENT

TIME, — that of Liverpool, under the charge of the Rev. David Thom. In Scotland, Universalists, considered as a distinct sect, are scarcely more prosperous than in England. They have generally adhered to that form of Universalism, which, with some more or less modifications, prevailed in England and America forty or fifty years ago. It embraces the doctrine of the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ, the popular doctrine of the atonement, and others of a kindred nature.

"Such is the external and internal condition of Universalism in Great Britain at the present time. What are its prospects for the future? We cannot withhold the expression of our sincere conviction, that the existing forms of Universalism there are destined to meet with but indifferent success. Our hopes, derived from this source, are far from sanguine. As Universalists now exist and believe in Great Britain, we do not flatter ourselves with the expectation of much progress." (*Expos.* May, 1840.)

The amount of organized Universalism in Europe is this: At Liverpool there is a society, which Universalists call flourishing. But the minister of that society does not regard the cause as quite so flourishing. To a Universalist in New York, in a letter bearing date March 30, 1836, he writes, "You cannot conceive the need which we [Universalists] have on this side of the Atlantic of being cheered on. *A few stragglers, amounting in all to some hundreds, is the sum of all our numbers.*" In Scotland there are three small congregations, numbering less than one hundred souls each. But these are Trinitarians, and make the doctrine of the Trinity the test of fellowship. They do not

recognize the Universalists of this country as Christians.

In truth, there is no Universalism in Europe, such as is thus called in America. THE SYSTEM OF AMERICAN UNIVERSALISM HAS NOT A SINGLE DEFENDER IN EUROPE.

No interest is felt upon the subject. The Universalists in this country cannot secure any respect or attention from the believers in the salvation of all men in Europe, when their real sentiments are known. Prof. Tholuck, of Germany, was at one time claimed by the Universalists as one of their number. Mr. T. J. Sawyer, of New York, wrote to Prof. T. upon the subject, and received a very courteous reply. Imboldened by this civility, Mr. Sawyer wrote again. An American divine was at the house of the professor at this time, and made him acquainted with the views of Mr. S. and his associates. Prof. Tholuck was astounded. He supposed the Universalists differed from the evangelical community only in the duration of future punishment. But when he found Universalism to be distinguished from infidelity only by a professed belief in the Bible, denying all its doctrines, and agreeing with infidelity in all but one point, he declined all further correspondence.

Some time after this, Mr. Sawyer proposed a visit to Germany. He wrote to a German divine in relation to the reception he would probably receive. He was informed, in reply, that all the pulpits in Germany would be closed against him.

Great joy was expressed, when it was announced in this country that Mrs. Sherwood, of England, had become a Universalist. A box, containing a copy of

each of their principal publications, was sent to this lady by some American Universalists, which, however, much to their mortification, was returned unopened.

Mr. C. F. Lefevre, of New York, proposed a visit to Europe. A Universalist paper thus announces his intentions: —

"We are permitted to state, for the information of the friends of our cause generally, that Br. C. F. Lefevre, pastor of the Third Universalist Society in this city, has determined on devoting some six or eight months to a tour in Europe. A desire to visit once more his connections there, together with the earnest solicitations of a friend, who is about visiting Europe, has primarily led to this determination. Not the least object, however, which Br. Lefevre has in view, is, to see and learn more of our cause in that region. It is his design to travel, preaching the kingdom, and proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ, wherever it can conveniently be effected. The Lord willing, he hopes to be able to lift his voice in defence of God's universal and efficient grace, in London, in Paris, in St. Petersburg, and if possible, in Rome." (*Univ. Union.*)

Mr. Lefevre records his success in a letter written after his return. He was introduced to a Unitarian clergyman, who invited him to preach in his pulpit. Mr. Lefevre adds, —

"He officiates in a small chapel at Newington, adjoining London; and I accepted the invitation. The day was very unfavorable, and the congregation did not exceed thirty people; if it had been very fair, I should have probably had twenty more. *This was the only time I officiated* during my res-

idence in Europe; it was the ONLY *opportunity that was afforded me.* The Unitarians in England are all Universalists, but they know not that name, nor any one that bears it. When the Unitarian clergy from the United States have visited England, their services have been in much demand, for they have been heard of by the reading community; whereas the Universalists are unknown. There were plenty of inquiries about Channing, Dewey, &c.; but Ballou, Balfour, &c., were names unknown. There has been a correspondence between American and English Unitarians, which has served to unite them; but the Universalists have had none, by the same distinctive appellation as themselves, with whom they could have epistolary intercourse. Again, I discovered a lurking prejudice against us, derived from American Unitarians. Whitman's *friendly* 'Letters' are not unknown, either in word or spirit. I have made these remarks with no unfriendly feelings towards the English Unitarians; but it may serve to solve a question which will arise in the minds of your readers, how it happened that I was so little engaged in my profession during my abode in London.

"I inquired, from such sources as I thought most likely to obtain information, about Relly, Murray, and Winchester. Of the two former, I never met any one that had heard any thing, while most reading people were familiar with the name of the latter. During the last week of my residence in London, I received a letter from a Mr. Thom, of Liverpool, who has been preaching Universalism to his congregation. He sent me a very pressing invitation to come and see him,

and preach the word; but I had made such engagements that it was not convenient for me to comply with his request. I very much regretted that circumstances prevented the only chance afforded me of meeting a brother in the faith, and thus closed every avenue to my ministerial labors." (*Univ. Union*, November, 1836.)

Such is Universalism in the land of its birth. The names of its founders have perished, though they have not been dead fifty years. American Universalism exists in no part of Europe. The names of its defenders are unknown. A popular preacher settled over one of the most important Universalist societies in the metropolis of America, goes to Europe, "to lift up his voice in defence of God's universal and efficient grace, in London, in Paris, in St. Petersburg, and if possible, in Rome." He goes out as the organ of the Universalist denomination, being appointed by the General Convention of Universalists as a delegate to visit the liberal churches in Europe, and open correspondence with them. He preaches once; that is all; and then, by courtesy, to a congregation of thirty persons; and, under the most favorable circumstances, the number might have been swelled to fifty!!!

Bear in mind the boasting of Universalists about their success, their increase, and their prospects; and then compare it with their success in Europe since 1788.

Compare the boasted success and increase of Universalism with the rapid and unparalleled spread of Methodism. The Methodist denomination is no older than the denomination of Universalists. Wesley and

Murray were contemporaries. The Methodist church numbers more professed Christians than any Christian sect in existence. A place can hardly be found upon the globe where the gospel has been carried, in which a Methodist altar does not stand. Upon the churches of this denomination the sun never sets. In Europe, the Methodists number their ministers by thousands and their churches by tens of thousands. Universalism has run the same length of time, and now numbers one society in England, and three feeble societies in Scotland, who do not allow American Universalists to be Christians. Four feeble societies in all Europe, after an existence of fifty years, are all that Universalism has to boast of. How evident is it that Universalism contains the elements of its own ruin! that it is on the wane!

When I reflect that the names of evangelical ministers who were contemporary with the founders of Universalism, are still fresh in the memories and affections of all good men; that those who have turned many to righteousness, can be traced back, through all ages of the church, to the time of the Savior, and even back to Enoch; and then, when I know that the names of the authors of Universalism have already perished, though a half of a century has not passed since their works of darkness were begun,—I am impressed with the prediction of the Word of God, "The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance;" "The memory of the just is blessed; but the name of the wicked shall rot." (*Ps.* cxii. 6. *Prov.* x. 7.)

My work attempted in this lecture is now finished.

I have by no means exhausted my subject. But I have said enough to exhibit the dreadful moral tendency of Universalism. The picture is an awful one. But, Universalists being judges, it is too true. I tremble, as I review this subject, to think that once I was employed in extending this baneful influence. I am astounded and overwhelmed when I think of that display of sovereign grace that snatched me from such soul-destroying work. The wealth of the universe would offer no inducement for me to return to it, or lift a finger to forge or fasten the chains of Satan upon immortal souls. To give up Universalism cost me almost my life. So fatal is this error, so withering its tendency! It has brought down upon me an almost unparalleled persecution. But if this is the price that I must pay for lifting up my voice, exposing error, and warning my fellow-men, be it so. God give me grace to meet all in a becoming spirit! Like Paul, I preached error. Like him, I have repented. Like him, in some humble manner, may I be fitted to preach the faith which once I destroyed!

CONCLUSION.

All candid minds must allow that Universalism may be false. The best of our race find in the Bible a different doctrine; and this class comprises the great mass of professing Christians in the entire world. The hazard those run who trust this delusion, is very great. Nearly the whole Christian world, the faith of nations, the Word of God, the voice of conscience, speak of a judgment after death, and

bid all prepare for it before this probation closes. If this is truly so, and any neglect this preparation, the consequences will be awfully fatal. It will be a suicidal act; and as much more fatal than the rash act that ends this life as eternity is more momentous than time. It will be a mistake of such magnitude, that eternity will not be long enough to enable them to correct the error.

On the other hand, a few unlettered men stand up, after the religion of Christ has been established for eighteen centuries, and deny these truths. They teach that the conduct of this life can have no effect upon the destiny of men in the next; that men have nothing to fear beyond the grave; that, live or die as they may, all will be well in eternity.

Suppose all this be true, and you disbelieve it; will it harm you? Suppose you fear God, are devout and holy; will this exclude you from heaven? By no means. But suppose Universalism be false, and, unwashed, unholy, unprepared, you are called to judgment; will that delusion save you from eating the fruits of your doings?

No one has any fears for a righteous man. All allow that he is safe, come what will. Form that character, and all will be well. Make Christ your portion, and Universalism, if true, will not harm you. If false, it will not. And the question at issue between Universalists and others is not in respect to the future condition of the good. There can be no dispute on that point. All believe that they will be blessed. But Universalism teaches that it will be *as well with the wicked*. Here is the difference. While,

then, you have every thing to gain by rejecting Universalism, and every thing to lose by trusting it, can any one be so unwise as to embrace it, and thus lose his own soul?

But it has no good practical result to offer. It can do no good. Its influence is evil, and wholly evil. It has no claim upon men that deism cannot present. It has less. Deism has all the sanctions to promote virtue that this world offers. And Universalism has no more. Deism goes beyond this life. It not only has that natural fear of death, but also that dread of something after death, that makes the worst of men

> "Rather bear the ills they have
> Than fly to others that they know not of."

Universalism removes all this. It assures men that there is nothing to dread after death; and that any soul who can have faith enough to cut the slender thread of life, will step, at once, beyond the reach of sorrow and suffering, forever, into perfect happiness.

And we have seen its real moral influence. We need no argument to teach us what it must do. We can look and see what its results really are. By its influence men walk not in the fear of God. It carries no joy to the drunkard's home. It sets up no altar at the infidel's fireside. It makes no prayerless heart pious and devout. It has no benevolent influence, but has opposed every good work; and good men do not need it to make them happy. When evil men trust it, they do so because it strengthens "the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his *wicked way, by promising* him life."

Can this be the gospel? Would it be well with the institutions of our country if Universalism should prevail? Must not a system that holds out such views of God, of providence, and of eternity, be dreadfully licentious? Can a rational, immortal man peril his safety upon a foundation that must fail in the day of trial?

An hour is at hand — and to some of us it may be very near — when these questions must be answered; an hour in which deception can no longer be practised; in which earth's vanities will assume their true worth, and the fascinations of life no longer allure or charm; in which all of us will "discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not."

Aged men, are you prepared for that hour? Where will your trust be, when your sun sets in darkness, perhaps in blood? Ye strong and vigorous, where will be your strength, when vigor ceases, and your Maker calls? Ye young, ye vain, ye gay, — lovers of pleasure more than of God, — who will hold you, who will guide you, when your feet stumble upon the dark mountains?

O, make not lies your refuge. Under falsehood seek not to hide yourself. There is a way of peace, a highway of safety and salvation. Let me entreat you to embrace it. Before you again lie down to slumber, resolve to be a Christian; and let the earliest breeze of a coming morn waft heavenward your sighs of penitence, and carry up to the throne of light the joyful news that Satan has lost a victim, and Christ gained a subject, in the repentance and conversion of a sinner.

I. REASON DEMANDS A FUTURE JUDGMENT.

1. On no other ground can the dealings of God to man be vindicated. The Bible pronounces God to be just and good. This does not fully appear in this life; and it never will be exhibited in the history of man, if there is no life but this in which a just retribution can take place.

Much in this life is dark, very dark. Hence many begin a course of error, by denying future retribution, and end in absolute atheism. In this world, there is a strange mixture of discord and crime. The haughty triumph, and oppression is seated in authority. The groans of the orphan arise; the cry of the widow and the fatherless is heard. The innocent suffer, because the wicked have arisen to power by fraud and violence. The good are oppressed, while profligates and tyrants riot in wealth and abundance. Meritorious characters pine in indigence, while the impious and the vile heap up wealth, and tread the paths of distinction. Generous actions are unrewarded, crimes are unpunished, and the most abandoned are often raised to stations of dignity and power.

Men of piety suffer for conscience' sake, borne up by the belief that their reward is on high. The most amiable and useful are cut down in the midst of their usefulness, while the wicked are left in this world to be still longer a burden and a curse. The affectionate husband, the intelligent son, the pious daughter, the useful member of society, are cut off in the very beginning of their usefulness; while those distinguished for unamiable and hurtful traits of character

The rejection of the doctrine of future judgment is the refuge sought out by those who would hush the voice of conscience, that they may serve sin rather than obey God. To establish this doctrine, is to sweep away the refuge of lies.

Universalism denies future judgment; it teaches that the judgment is limited to this world, and that all which men need fear, is found in this life. It assures all who listen to its teaching, that the testimony of the Bible, in respect to coming judgment, is either an Oriental figure, or has reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. Every argument employed to build up future judgment, is an argument against Universalism. To establish it, is to overthrow Universalism, and present, in vivid colors, the danger of trusting its teaching. And the design of this lecture is, to present AN ARGUMENT AGAINST UNIVERSALISM, DRAWN FROM FUTURE JUDGMENT. May He, whose Spirit alone can make the word fruitful, so guide my heart and yours, that the truth may be commended to every conscience in the sight of God!

By future judgment, I mean not only the act of judging the world at the last day, but the results of that judgment,—the doom of the ungodly, their punishment, and their changeless destiny. I mean, by the term, all that the Bible teaches by its representations of future punishment,—of "the resurrection of damnation," "the resurrection of the unjust," of "casting the wicked into hell," of "going away into everlasting punishment." In this lecture, I shall use these terms interchangeably; for so are they *used* in the Bible.

"they are not in trouble as other men, neither are they plagued;" "their eyes stands out with fatness, they have more than heart can wish." (*Ps.* lxxiii. 3—5.)

Where, then, is the justice of God? where is his hatred of sin? where his love for holiness and goodness? Can equity, can impartial goodness, be constituent principles in the divine government if there be no world in which sin is adequately punished, and virtue and holiness rewarded?

In this life God makes a distinction between men, as to their circumstances and privileges. He does not in this world treat all men alike. The ungodly, the reckless, the abandoned, are oftentimes the most favored. How, then, can it be proved that God is a holy God, that he prefers obedience to transgression, and goodness to depravity? Not by what appears in this life; for here, the good are oppressed, the righteous are afflicted, and the impious and the abandoned prosper.

Suppose a sovereign should announce himself to be just and good; affirm that he desired the obedience and the happiness of all his subjects; suppose he should declare that the only passport to his favor would be obedience to his law and submission to his will; and yet should load with honor, and advance to posts of distinction, all who rebelled against him, and neglect or afflict all who attempted to do his will. Who would not feel that either he was not what he professed to be, or else that another day must exhibit his justice and goodness, and explain his present inexplicable conduct?

No reasonable man can behold the providence of

are spared. Indeed, the whole existence of man, apart from another life, is inexplicable, if the experience of the present life is to have no effect hereafter. If all are to start again upon the same level, however they may have lived here, why live here at all? Why all the pains and distresses incident to the present constitution of our being? Why live, and go through the various perils from birth to death, if no purpose is answered by it? On the theory of Universalism, this state of existence is utterly irreconcilable with the justice and benevolence of God. It has led many to deny the divine goodness, and even to doubt the existence of God.

2. Without a judgment to come, there can be neither equity nor impartial rule in the divine government. We behold in this life what Universalists say cannot exist in the next, in harmony with the divine attributes,—a great difference in the characters of men, as well as in their circumstances and privileges. All do not share equally in wealth and distinction; all are not equally exempt from misfortune, affliction, and death; nor do all enjoy an equal amount of social, moral, and religious advantages.

This difference is not based upon merit; for the good do not always prosper; the wicked are not distinguished for adversity and trouble: it is more frequently the reverse. To be rich, honored, or prosperous, men do not feel that they must fear God. Almost all the national, social, and intellectual advantages we enjoy, are independent of moral character.

As in the time of the monarch David, so now, the *wicked* prosper; "there are no bands in their death;"

of human actions cease not with the life of the actor. They run on after his death. Men often do more good or evil after their death than while they lived.

Howard's conduct influences more men now than when he lived. He has been the author of more good since his death, than he accomplished during his life. No prison is reared, no hospital built, no institution for the unfortunate of our race planned, over which the spirit of Howard does not preside. He lays the foundation and brings forth the topstone.

Who does not know that Paul still preaches the gospel of Christ? He preaches to more souls, in more climes, in more languages, than he could reach while he lived. More souls every year are converted to God through his labors since his death, than were saved by his instrumentality during his whole life.

Paul's ministry was a short one. He was often imprisoned and scourged; the malice of his enemies paralyzed his usefulness and cut short his personal efforts in the cause of truth. But since his death, thousands have proclaimed his words, and countless thousands have believed to the saving of the soul. How, then, could Howard or Paul have been rewarded in this life according to their works, seeing they have done more good since their death than they could possibly do while they lived? Paul discourses to us in the text of the judgment-seat of Christ; and so will he preach till time shall be no more.

Take another class of men. Look at those who are appropriately named "the scourges of our race." Did Catiline's example have no influence after his death? Did all the events of which Bonaparte was the author,

God here, and separate the conduct of men in this life from the retributions of eternity, without feeling that God can be neither holy, just, nor good. All must feel that equity and impartial dealing cannot belong to the government of God, unless there is a state of eternal retribution beyond the grave.

It is in vain to argue that the present is a state of perfect retribution, and that all the consequences of human action are bounded by time. It is not so. There are two considerations which demonstrate that men are not, and cannot be, rewarded in this world according to their deeds.

1. On Universalist grounds, the end of punishment is not answered in this life. On this theory, men are punished to reform them, not for the good of others; not to magnify the law, but to promote their own good. The amount of punishment which the sinner deserves, and which he will receive, according to this theory, is the amount necessary to reform him. This, if Universalism be true, is rewarding men "according to their works." Does all discipline in this life have the proposed effect? Are all the vicious reformed? By no means. Men are more frequently made worse by their troubles. They grow harder under the rod; they die in impenitence. Then they are not sufficiently punished. They are not in this life rewarded according to their works, for they are not made better. Punishment must, then, exist in the next world, else men will nowhere be adequately punished.

2. As God has constituted us, the present cannot be a life of perfect retribution, because the results

of human actions cease not with the life of the actor. They run on after his death. Men often do more good or evil after their death than while they lived.

Howard's conduct influences more men now than when he lived. He has been the author of more good since his death, than he accomplished during his life. No prison is reared, no hospital built, no institution for the unfortunate of our race planned, over which the spirit of Howard does not preside. He lays the foundation and brings forth the topstone.

Who does not know that Paul still preaches the gospel of Christ? He preaches to more souls, in more climes, in more languages, than he could reach while he lived. More souls every year are converted to God through his labors since his death, than were saved by his instrumentality during his whole life.

Paul's ministry was a short one. He was often imprisoned and scourged; the malice of his enemies paralyzed his usefulness and cut short his personal efforts in the cause of truth. But since his death, thousands have proclaimed his words, and countless thousands have believed to the saving of the soul. How, then, could Howard or Paul have been rewarded in this life according to their works, seeing they have done more good since their death than they could possibly do while they lived? Paul discourses to us in the text of the judgment-seat of Christ; and so will he preach till time shall be no more.

Take another class of men. Look at those who are appropriately named "the scourges of our race." Did Catiline's example have no influence after his death? Did all the events of which Bonaparte was the author,

and all the causes of which he laid the train, cease to do injury when he died? Voltaire, Bolingbroke, and Thomas Paine, have done more injury to our race since their death than they were capable of doing while they lived. They corrupt more youth, destroy more good principles, and ruin more souls, than they ever did while alive. Where, then, can these men be rewarded according to their works? Not in this life; for they were dead before the large part of the evil of which they were the authors was developed.

Actions are good or bad according to their effect, not according to the length of a man's life, or the time he occupied in committing them. As, then, the amount of good or evil done cannot be estimated till the results cease, and as these run on sometimes ages after the actor is dead, how can men here be rewarded *according* to their deeds? How can the account be fairly settled, till the amount is fully known?

This is strikingly illustrated in the history of Bolingbroke. His most pernicious books were not published till after his death. He left in his will a sum of money to defray the expenses of printing his works, and it was expended according to his direction. His labors did not begin to exert their dreadful influence upon our race till their author had left this mortal state. How could he be rewarded for his deeds in this life, seeing he was cold in death before they really took effect? Reason, then, no less than revelation, demands a future judgment. So taught the apostle; and when before Felix he spoke "concerning *the faith* in Christ," "he reasoned of judgment to *come.*"

II. CONSCIENCE POINTS TO A JUDGMENT TO COME.

The universal belief of men in the retributions of another life, shows that conscience gives a uniform lesson on this subject. No man feels safe. To every mind there is "a certain fearful looking for of judgment." It is seen in the tendency of our race to dwell upon the dark side of every event, and to interpret every strange and mysterious occurrence as an omen of evil, or a token of divine anger. Men know something of their own wickedness. They know they are not punished as much as they deserve, and they are fearful that God is about to bring them to judgment.

A fine illustration of this is found in the book of Daniel. "Belshazzar, the king, made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." To insult the God of the Hebrews, he "commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem;" vessels consecrated to the service of the Lord of Hosts. The king and his companions "drank wine, and praised the gods of gold and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone. In the same hour came forth the fingers of a man's hand, and wrote upon the plaster of the wall." No one knew the nature of the writing, nor could the wise men of the city read it. Yet, when the king saw the part of the hand that wrote, his countenance changed, and his knees smote one against another. But why this agitation and alarm? Why not regard this mysterious inscription

as an omen of good? Why not fill up the vessels of God's house, and drink deeper? Why not call for music, for the song, and the dance? Why not point to the inscription, and, with exultation, exclaim, "See, the gods have accepted the offerings of this night of revelry, and are well pleased. They have thus signified their pleasure. Yonder stands the sentence which promises long life to your king, and prosperity to his kingdom."

Not so thought that impious monarch. He could not read the writing, but he well knew it boded no good to him or his kingdom. Conscience told that wicked king that the God whom he had insulted was about to take vengeance upon him, and call him to judgment. And, when Daniel gave the interpretation of the hand-writing, he did but confirm what conscience had already made known.

III. TESTIMONY OF THE BIBLE.

That all men must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, is a truth not written in one or two isolated passages in the Bible. It runs through the entire Scriptures, and makes the basis of all the instructions and sanctions of the divine Word. By it, good men were urged to duty, and evil men were held in awe. Patriarchs and prophets desired to obtain the resurrection of the just. Apostles labored, that they might give up their account with joy, and not with grief. And the spotless Son of God was influenced by considerations drawn from the future life, when, "*for the joy that was set before him*," he "endured the cross,

lust, denies the coming of the Lord, because "all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." He establishes the fact that, by the word of God, the old world was destroyed. He then adds, "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." (2 *Pet.* iii. 7.) On this passage, I remark, —

1. Here is an acknowledged judgment alluded to — the drowning of the old world by the word of God.

2. It points to another destruction — a destruction in another world, in the day of judgment, by another agent. The first was by water; the last is to be by fire.

3. This judgment is appointed for "the perdition of ungodly men." No matter when they lived, whether before or after the flood. No matter by what means they were taken out of the world. All the ungodly will, in the day of judgment, be punished, when the heavens and earth are consumed.

4. Not only the heavens and earth are kept in store, held in their place by the Almighty arm, till the day of judgment, but ungodly men are also *reserved* unto that day to be punished. They are not *now* punished, but "*reserved* unto the day of judgment to be punished." (ii. 9.) And the sweeping away of the old world by the flood was an admonition to the ungodly, because that guilty race were still reserved unto the punishments of the great day.

Universalists attempt to evade the fearful teachings of this passage, by referring it to the destruction of

only punishment, and their death releasing them from sin and suffering.

If the first be true, then the fact cited is proof of a judgment to come; if the second, then the Bible elsewhere deceives us. It teaches that the pure in heart, only, shall see God, and that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. But the truth is, holiness and purity are not essential to salvation. Depravity, utter and entire, is the one thing needful. But for this, the old world would not so soon have been glorified. This hastened the day of their redemption, and made it complete. And, for want of it, the servants of God were left behind, and, for a season, at least, were shut out from glory.

The true reason why all the human family are not forever beyond the reach of sorrow and suffering, is not that they have not done the will of God, have not laid up treasures in heaven, are not yet holy and good, but because they are not yet as wicked as were the people of the old world. They are not yet sufficiently depraved to deprive them of an existence in this world, and introduce them into heaven. When any man or nation becomes so corrupt and depraved, that God will not allow him to live on earth, then he will be a candidate for endless felicity, and may hourly look for the mandate which shall take him up to that holy place, where all is purity and bliss.

But the book of inspiration is authority for the assertion that the destruction of the old world is a proof of future judgment.

St. Peter, in his Second Epistle, alludes to the *unbelief* of the scoffer, who, walking after his own

tion of the old world, and foretells the doom of the earth which now is, together with the perdition of ungodly men, also informs us that scoffers would arise, cavilling at past judgments, and mocking at those which are to come. How strikingly is this prediction fulfilled by the preaching of the Universalists of our day!

2. *The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is a Proof of future Punishment.*

God turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, because of their unparalleled depravity. If Universalism be true, it was no judgment. It was the greatest blessing ever conferred upon any people. It wiped out in a moment all their crimes, cleansed them from all impurity, and took them from a world of woe, and introduced them into perfect bliss. Enoch was translated, because he pleased God. The guilty Sodomites, on the theory of Universalism, shared the same distinguished favor for an opposite reason. How, too, can we explain the conduct of Abraham,—his earnest, impassioned, long-continued entreaty that Sodom might be spared, if he believed that the threatened doom would convey them into glory? If such things did not attend their destruction, then Universalism is false; and the punishment of Sodom is proof of future retribution.

The Savior makes an application of this judgment to the eternal world. "Verily I say unto you, *It shall be more* tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city." (*Mark* vi. 11.) In this passage, Jesus announces that the doom

Jerusalem! Poor Jerusalem, no wonder thou art trodden under foot, when so much is laid upon thee!

But look at the absurdity of this application. This was written to Gentile Christians who lived upon the borders of the Black Sea, nearly one thousand miles from the city of Jerusalem. They were not Jews, and had no interest in that city; and whether it stood, or were destroyed, was a subject of no personal concern to them. To call upon them to repent, to warn them of danger, to talk about the perdition of ungodly men, because Jerusalem was about to be destroyed, would be as absurd as for me to call upon Universalists to renounce their errors, because there is war in China, and a prospect that soon Canton would be in the hands of the British admiral.

5. We have the geological fact that the earth contains the elements of its own ruin, even that mentioned by the apostle,—its destruction by fire. Apart from the doctrine of central heat, we all know that the atmosphere which surrounds this globe contains the principle of flame. And, if it were not connected with another ingredient, instantly one immense sheet of flame would envelop the universe. The Almighty can separate these principles at any moment. His word is all that binds them together. Let him speak, and it is done. Let him do this, and, as Peter announces, the elements will melt with fervent heat, and be dissolved. The universal blaze, extending over sea and land, would more than realize the awful, the startling descriptions of that fearful hour, which are recorded in the Bible.

The same inspired pen which records the destruc-

tion of the old world, and foretells the doom of the earth which now is, together with the perdition of ungodly men, also informs us that scoffers would arise, cavilling at past judgments, and mocking at those which are to come. How strikingly is this prediction fulfilled by the preaching of the Universalists of our day!

2. *The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is a Proof of future Punishment.*

God turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, because of their unparalleled depravity. If Universalism be true, it was no judgment. It was the greatest blessing ever conferred upon any people. It wiped out in a moment all their crimes, cleansed them from all impurity, and took them from a world of woe, and introduced them into perfect bliss. Enoch was translated, because he pleased God. The guilty Sodomites, on the theory of Universalism, shared the same distinguished favor for an opposite reason. How, too, can we explain the conduct of Abraham,—his earnest, impassioned, long-continued entreaty that Sodom might be spared, if he believed that the threatened doom would convey them into glory? If such things did not attend their destruction, then Universalism is false; and the punishment of Sodom is proof of future retribution.

The Savior makes an application of this judgment to the eternal world. "Verily I say unto you, *It shall be more* tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city." (*Mark* vi. *11.) In this* passage, Jesus announces that the doom

of Sodom is not yet complete. For in the day of judgment, "it *shall* be more tolerable," not *appear* to be. In what sense is this true, if Sodom and Gomorrah received all their punishment thousands of years before this prediction was uttered?

Peter thus refers to it: "turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly." (2 *Pet.* ii. 6.) If God made them an ensample to those who after should live ungodly, then all the ungodly will be punished, as were the people of Sodom. But this is not true in this life. No other city was ever destroyed by fire and brimstone out of heaven. No other people was thus removed from earth. And no ungodly man fears that, if he do not repent, fire and brimstone from God out of heaven will consume him. If, then, Sodom and Gomorrah are not exposed to a punishment which all impenitent men will share, then it is not true that God has made them "an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly."

But Jude teaches us that, in common with the angels who kept not their first estate, but who are "reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day," "Sodom and Gomorrah" "are set forth for *an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" (*Jude* 6, 7.) Their fate after death, their present suffering, and "the judgment of the great day," that awaits them, make them an example. They are a warning to the ungodly; *for all who live and die in sin must share their condemnation.*

;. *The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead is Proof of a future Judgment.*

)aniel says, "And many of them that sleep in the t of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, ; some to shame and everlasting contempt." Christ s, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves shall hear his ce, and shall come forth, they that have done d, unto the resurrection of life, and they that 'e done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." also promises his faithful disciples that they shall "recompensed at the resurrection of the just." ıl, before Felix, avows his faith in the "resurrec- ı of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." d it was in this connection that Felix trembled as apostle "reasoned of judgment to come." When persecuted Christians took joyfully the spoiling of ir goods, they did so because they knew that they l "in heaven a better and an enduring substance." 'thers were tortured, not accepting deliverance, t they might obtain a better resurrection." We d of "the resurrection of the dead, and the eternal lgment;" and of the first resurrection, of which the ssed and the holy will partake, and by which they l escape the second death.

A man who reads these and similar testimonies, and n denies a future judgment, is prepared to say,— ıe has not already so said in his heart,—"There ıo God."

4. *Death, as a Penalty for Sin, is another Proof of future Judgment.*

When God threatened Adam with death in the day of transgression, he understood all that his Maker expressed by that word. When Moses recorded this penalty, many years after it was announced, he used a word which, to his nation, conveyed the divine meaning. To *die* included all that the Jews expressed by that term when Moses wrote. And we all know that it included both the misery of the present and the future life—both the misery of the body and of the soul. As an illustration, turn to Ezek. xxxiii. 11: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"

Here the wicked are assured that, though God has no pleasure in their death, yet if they do not turn, they will die. The threatened death is not yet inflicted upon them; "Why will ye die?" They can escape it, if they will turn from their way; "Turn ye, turn ye." But if they do not turn, they must die.

There are but three deaths—temporal, spiritual, and eternal. One of these must be the threatened penalty of God's law. Is it natural death? Will the wicked escape this, if they forsake their wicked way? By no means; all must die, the evil and the good; those who fear God, and those who rebel against him. Natural death cannot be what men are threatened with

preaching of Jesus? Would they now spread, if men should hear nothing but the discourses of Christ?

The same truth is inculcated in texts like these: "Ye shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come." But what great punishment would there be in dying in sin, if no evils attended such a death in the immortal world? Millions have thus died. Millions more would do so, did they not fear exclusion from heaven. Such exclusion is plainly expressed in the words "whither I go ye *cannot* come." Christ went to heaven, to be seated at the right hand of God. Where will those be who *die* in sin? Surely not in heaven!

All the warnings and all the promises of Christ and the apostles had reference to the judgment. "But of *that day* and hour knoweth no man." "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in *the day* of judgment than for that city." "Many shall say to me in *that day*, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?" "They watch for your souls as they that must give an account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief." But why watch, if there is no account to be rendered up? Why fear, if all is well? What occasion is there for grief? "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at *that day*, and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing." But is there no day of judgment, in which the righteous Judge shall thus bestow a crown of life? Will all receive it, though it is promised only to those who love his appearing?

blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." What effect would such instruction have upon a people to whom these points were already matters of faith? Christ did not attempt to prove these doctrines, any more than he did the truth of God's existence and perfections. The people to whom he spoke already believed them. He simply reminded them of these great and solemn doctrines, and urged them to repentance in view of the solemn sanctions of eternity. We find no labored argument in the Bible to prove any of the leading doctrines of the gospel. Revelation is based upon them, and it would not have been given had not these doctrines been true.

Would the people who heard the Savior preach have learned that their views of future punishment were erroneous? Would they have been converted to Universalism by such teaching? Would they have felt that their treasures were already laid up in heaven? that there was no hell to be cast into? that there was no unpardonable sin? no eternal damnation? but that all would be forgiven? Would they have learned from his language that there was no danger of being cast into hell, soul and body? and that, therefore, it is absurd to *fear* God? or that a man *cannot* lose his soul? and that there is no eternal *punishment*? Could such opinions prevail through the

preaching of Jesus? Would they now spread, if men should hear nothing but the discourses of Christ?

The same truth is inculcated in texts like these: "Ye shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come." But what great punishment would there be in dying in sin, if no evils attended such a death in the immortal world? Millions have thus died. Millions more would do so, did they not fear exclusion from heaven. Such exclusion is plainly expressed in the words "whither I go ye *cannot* come." Christ went to heaven, to be seated at the right hand of God. Where will those be who *die* in sin? Surely not in heaven!

All the warnings and all the promises of Christ and the apostles had reference to the judgment. "But of *that day* and hour knoweth no man." "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in *the day* of judgment than for that city." "Many shall say to me in *that day*, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?" "They watch for your souls as they that must give an account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief." But why watch, if there is no account to be rendered up? Why fear, if all is well? What occasion is there for grief? "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at *that day*, and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing." But is there no day of judgment, in which the righteous Judge shall thus bestow a crown of life? Will all receive it, though it is promised only to those who love his appearing?

6. *The Text and Connection is another Proof of future Judgment.*

2 Cor. v. 1—11: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now, he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences."

The reference of these words to eternity cannot be disputed. Paul affirms that the body is to be destroyed. And for the soul he has much anxiety. 'Wherefore we labor, that, whether present [with the

Lord] or absent [from the body,] *we may be accepted with him.*" (v. 8.) His anxiety and fear, which induced him to labor constantly, that he might stand accepted with God, arose from the consideration of this fact, that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." (10, 11.)

The apostle assures us that he lived, labored, and preached, in view of future judgment. His aim was to secure the favor of his Lord, and stand accepted in the day of terror and of judgment. Was there nothing to fear,—no danger, if unfaithful, of his being a castaway? Then was Paul a deceiver. But if he is true, how false, how fatal is Universalism!

7. *The Conduct of holy Men of Old was regulated by Faith in a future Judgment.*

"Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed.——For he looked for a city which had foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God."

Moses, when he trampled upon the honors of Egypt, released himself from royal favor, and chose "rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season," was influenced by the retributions of eternity. "For he had respect unto the recompense of reward."

David's last thoughts are associated with the day of *judgment.* His dying advice to his son is worthy of *being inscribed* upon the heart of every young man:

"And thou, Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy fathers, and serve him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind.——If thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever."

To the day of judgment the Savior referred, in frequent and tender, but fearfully plain and even terrific terms. Equally faithful and equally plain were the apostles. The Athenians, when first the gospel was preached to them, heard of that "day in the which God would judge the world in righteousness." And as Paul reasoned of judgment to come, Felix trembled, and quaked in the presence of his prisoner.

In view of all this testimony, must not that be the most impious trifling imaginable, which can profess respect for and belief in the Bible, while it sets aside such instruction? Must not the blood of souls be found upon such teaching? Must not the destruction of those who thus wrest the Bible, and deceive and ruin their race, be deep and awful indeed?

8. *Practical Reflections.*

To die is a solemn thing. To look for the last time upon the golden sun and the beauteous creation, to exchange the sad farewell with all we love, to be cold as clay, is a fearful event to anticipate. Yet it must come to all. No countenance is so radiant with health and beauty, as to escape the grasp of death. The strongest pulsations will cease, and the most elastic step will falter, when death approaches. He will touch our frames with his icy finger, and all will be cold as marble.

But much more solemn is it to think of the judgment that follows death; to look forward to that hour in which we all shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ — stand in the presence of our Judge, to whom all things are open and manifest, who cannot err, and from whom no one can escape.

The judgment of the great day will be equitable: it will be a righteous judgment. In it, men will be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body. The condemned will acknowledge the righteousness of the decision. And in that day the righteous Judge shall give a crown of righteousness "unto all that love his appearing." But unto all others he will say, "Depart; I know you not."

From this decision there will be no appeal. No error will be found in the proceedings. No passion will sway the Judge, and prevent justice. But in the face of an assembled universe, in the presence of God, of Christ, of angels, of the spirits of just men made perfect, the judgment will proceed; and men will be rewarded according to their works. He who wept over Jerusalem when he pronounced its doom, will judge the world; he will do it in the same spirit of tenderness.

Universalists, unable to meet the arguments by which the doctrine of future judgment is sustained, attempt to divert the mind from this solemn truth by mocking at the idea; or so caricaturing the subject, that disgust may arise in the mind, and thus men be prevented from receiving the truth. They represent us as teaching that God is a stern and cruel being, sit-

ting upon his throne with his sword drawn, panting for a victim, and impatient for the hour when he may strike the fatal blow.

Be not deceived. God does not desire the death of the sinner. He has no pleasure in it. The gift of his only Son, the suffering and death of that Divine Being, the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the perpetuation of the gospel, with the day and means of grace, all prove that God is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

During the struggle for independence, when this nation was involved in war with Britain, the American army was stationed on the banks of the Hudson River. Beyond the lines of the army, a young man was taken by some American soldiers, and carried into the presence of the commander-in-chief. He was presumed to be a spy. As such he was tried, condemned, and sentenced to be hung. I scarcely need say that I refer to Major Andre. When the capture and condemnation of Andre were known, they excited universal commiseration. He was so young and accomplished, so noble and brave, that all pitied, all desired that he might escape his ignominious sentence. Petition after petition was sent to Washington, praying him to spare Andre, to review the proceedings, or to interpose his pardoning power. These petitions came from the best of our countrymen, — from those who would have given their hearts' blood, if the cause of American freedom had required it. The staff of the commander-in-chief, the officers of the army, united in the same request. But all this

effort was in vain. Washington was inflexible. He swept these petitions aside, signed the death-warrant, and Andre was executed.

The point to which I wish to call your attention is this: Was Washington hard of heart? Was he alone unmoved, when all the country were interested? When every bosom sympathized, and every eye wept, was his heart the only one that was hard, his eye the only one that refused to weep? Sitting alone, reviewing the petitions of his countrymen, did he say, "These men wish to take from me my victim. I have long sought for one. My appetite shall be satisfied. Andre shall die." No; such a foul stain does not rest upon the character of Washington.

He wished not the death of Andre; and he would have saved him, if he could have done it consistently with his high sense of duty. No heart bled more than his at the untimely fate of that noble officer. And the death-warrant, read to Andre upon the scaffold, was *wet with the tears of Washington.* He wept as he signed it. He pitied, but he could not save. As a man, he would have pardoned; but, as a judge, — as one to whom was committed the great interests of American freedom, — he could not. There was treason in the camp. No one knew where it began, or where it would end. An example must be made, and Andre must be executed.

So is it with the Judge of the universe. "Have I any pleasure in your death?" is his tender language to the sinner. "Turn ye, turn ye, for *why* will ye die?" is his affecting inquiry. But, if the sinner *will not abandon* his way; if he will not turn and

live; if he persist in disobeying God, and will go, unwashed and unprepared, to the judgment,—then upon his own head his blood will be found.

O, what a day will that be, in which the trump of the archangel shall summon a world to judgment! when the great congregation of the dead "shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt"! when "all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" to a resurrection of life or damnation! when the sea shall give up its dead! when those who have slept where ocean's bed is deepest,—who have gone down to their watery tomb amid the roar of the billows and the fury of the storm,—when all, all shall stand before God! What then will the things of time and sense be worth? Bitterly, most bitterly, will many mourn over opportunities wasted and time misspent.

"That day of wrath, that dreadful day,
When heaven and earth shall pass away,
What power shall be the sinner's stay?
How shall he meet that dreadful day?

"When, shrivelling like a parched scroll,
The flaming heavens together roll;
And louder yet, and yet more dread,
Swells the high trump that wakes the dead;—

"O! on that day, that wrathful day,
When man to judgment wakes from clay,
Be thou, O Christ, the sinner's stay,
Though heaven and earth shall pass away!"

Truly, "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands

ADDRESS TO CHRISTIANS

IN RELATION TO

UNIVERSALISTS AND UNIVERSALISM

GAL. vi. 7.

BE NOT DECEIVED.

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

IF you have prayerfully considered the examination of Universalism, and the exhibition of its moral tendency, which have been laid before you in these lectures, you need no additional proof to convince you that it is a most pernicious error. You will admit that its claims, as a religious system, are unfounded; that it is supported only by assumption, by sophistry, and by a violent wresting and palpable perversion of the Word of God. It is a delusion of the most dangerous kind; and he who trusts it is in danger of doing an irreparable injury to his own soul.

Universalism is in the midst of you; and you must meet it. Your sons and your daughters are exposed to its seductions; and you must protect them. What, then, is your duty in respect to this delusion? Will you indulge me in a few suggestions on this subject? I offer them from the conviction that, if heeded, they will guide you in the path of duty.

Lamb's book of life! And, when the full chorus shall go up from the redeemed, may your voice and mine blend with that mighty, that blood-washed throng, in their ascriptions of praise to the Lamb of Calvary, the Redeemer and the Judge of men!

ADDRESS TO CHRISTIANS

IN RELATION TO

UNIVERSALISTS AND UNIVERSALISM

GAL. vi. 7.

BE NOT DECEIVED.

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

If you have prayerfully considered the examination of Universalism, and the exhibition of its moral tendency, which have been laid before you in these lectures, you need no additional proof to convince you that it is a most pernicious error. You will admit that its claims, as a religious system, are unfounded; that it is supported only by assumption, by sophistry, and by a violent wresting and palpable perversion of the Word of God. It is a delusion of the most dangerous kind; and he who trusts it is in danger of doing an irreparable injury to his own soul.

Universalism is in the midst of you; and you must meet it. Your sons and your daughters are exposed to its seductions; and you must protect them. What, then, is your duty in respect to this delusion? Will you indulge me in a few suggestions on this subject? I offer them from the conviction that, if heeded, they *will guide you in* the path of duty.

1. BE NOT DECEIVED IN RESPECT TO THE DOCTRINES OF UNIVERSALISM.

You are in danger from this source. Many intelligent persons are not aware that modern Universalism, in any respect, differs from the system of Murray. And it is one of the great efforts of Universalist teachers to deceive in this respect. They will talk of "father Murray" and "father Mitchell," as though they held to the opinions of those men. Humanitarians as they are, they will talk of the divinity of the Savior. Revilers of experimental religion, they will talk about the new birth. And the terms *faith*, *repentance*, and *holiness*, they use without attaching any meaning to them. An acquaintance with the peculiar doctrines of Universalism as they now are, is essential to an enlightened opposition to this error.

2. BE NOT DECEIVED WITH THE ASSURANCE THAT UNIVERSALISTS ARE BECOMING MORE RELIGIOUS.

Within a few months, the practice of these men seems to have undergone a change. They have, all at once, in words, become friends of religion, of revivals, and of prayer meetings. In some places, it is said, they have anxious seats, and invite persons to come forward for prayers. In some of our secular papers I have seen it stated that several persons were baptized by a Universalist minister, and joined a Universalist church. We have already seen what a profession of Universalism amounts to. It involves no moral change. None is required as a condition of church membership; none is expected. Should all the members of a Universalist congregation join the

church, it would not increase the strength of the body. And as to baptism, Universalists having no principle in the matter, they will immerse, or sprinkle, or do neither, as the case may demand.

Do you ask how I explain this change in the practice of Universalists, and the adoption of customs which they have so long and so violently opposed? I reply that the history of Sanballat the Horonite answers the question.

When Nehemiah visited Jerusalem, to repair the city, and thus take away its reproach, the enemies of Israel were "grieved exceedingly that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel." A large and imposing force of enemies to the rebuilding of the city came upon this servant of God, to prevent the work. Sanballat, their leader, denied the *right* of Nehemiah to rebuild, and accused him of a design to rebel against the king. Nehemiah produced the authority of the king. Sanballat next tried to check the work by ridicule; but in vain. He next attempted to attain the desired end by violence, and gathered his forces together for battle. But the prophet was prepared even for this. Nor was the work delayed one hour. As a last resort, stratagem was employed. Sanballat professed to take a great interest in the work in which Nehemiah was engaged. The prophet had mistaken his movements entirely. He was not opposed to the rebuilding of Jerusalem. He was very glad the good work was going on, and most earnestly wished to take part in the holy enterprise. He invited Nehemiah to leave his work for a *short time*, and come down to hold with him a friend-

ly interview. But the prophet knew the man. "I am doing a great work, and cannot come down," was the conclusive reply. (*Neh.* iv.—vi.)

At the commencement of their organized career, Universalists opposed the doctrines and customs of Christians, on the ground that they were not sanctioned by God. Little notice was taken of their statements, and it was found convenient to change the mode of attack. Ridicule was next tried. Their pulpits and papers abounded with caricatures of religion, with low jests about the habits of ministers, with ridicule of the convictions of the sinner, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the conference and prayer meetings. But still the work went on. Then came opposition. This has been the almost incessant work of the Universalist ministry for the past twenty years. No one who has glanced at their periodicals need be told of this. They challenge every body to a discussion, and if a minister preaches a sermon to his own people upon judgment, or eternity, he will probably have inflicted upon him a letter from some Universalist teacher, calling him to an account.

But all has done little towards checking the increase of Orthodoxy. Denying the truth of its doctrines, ridiculing its customs and its labors, assailing its sacred truths by scoffing and misrepresentation,—all have failed to answer the end in view. "What do we?" is the language of these men. "One thing remains to be done. Let us be like the Orthodox. We will have revivals, prayer meetings, and baptisms. We will avouch that our opposition was misunderstood. *We will* invite Christians to help us, to come down

munity that the general impression, that death was the penalty, rested upon ignorance or prejudice, and invite "the candid and the liberal" to hear him defend his opinions. Who would listen to his ravings? All would feel that the avowal of such opinions was an impeachment of their common sense. Who would believe that an enlightened community, with the statute-book in their hands, needed a public lecture to teach them what it contained? If the community wish to know what the Bible teaches with respect to the destiny of our race, they must "search the Scriptures," not attend the ministry of men whose employment it is to "handle the word of God deceitfully."

Let me illustrate this point. A mariner approaches the coast of Norway. Upon his chart is laid down a whirlpool of surpassing power. Its latitude and longitude are minutely described. Some one on board the vessel suggests to the officer that he has no faith in the existence of that whirlpool; that God made the sea, as well as the land; that he is infinitely good, and would not place such a dangerous and useless gulf in the highway of nations. The unbeliever invites the officer to be liberal, and visit the whirlpool; to be candid, and take one sweep around the outer circumference. Would the invitation be accepted?

We are on a voyage. The Bible is our chart; and it points out fearful dangers. Universalism has no faith in the existence of these dangers. It urges all, who listen to its voice, to ride upon the whirlpool. 'My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not."

Universalist preachers frequently hold out inducements to the community to enter their places of meeting. They are to explain a difficult text, preach upon some novel topic, or have some exhibition or display. Be not deceived. Let no inducement lead you into temptation. You cannot, before going to a Universalist meeting, retire to your closet, and, in sincerity, pray, "Lead us not into temptation."

Nor can you assign any reason which will justify your hearing a Universalist preach. You have friends, you say, who attend such a meeting, and who offer to go with you, if you will attend, a part of the time, with them. Would you attend a theatre, upon condition that a friend would, the next evening, attend a prayer meeting with you? Would you go into the abodes of crime upon such a condition? Why not, if the reasoning be sound? Make no such bargains. If you have friends who attend Universalist preaching, admonish them; but, if they persist in that course, let them walk the way of death alone.

Is your candor appealed to, to hear both sides? Be not deceived. What is the question Universalism wishes you to consider? Simply whether their faith is supported by the Bible or not. For the answer to this question, to what must you go? to the Bible, or the Universalist meeting? If a man should assert that the Bible sustains Mormonism or atheism, would you feel called upon to hear him support his blasphemies, or would you "search the Scriptures," to see whether his claims were well founded?

Suppose a man were to assert that there was no *penalty* against the crime of murder, assure the com-

munity that the general impression, that death was the penalty, rested upon ignorance or prejudice, and invite "the candid and the liberal" to hear him defend his opinions. Who would listen to his ravings? All would feel that the avowal of such opinions was an impeachment of their common sense. Who would believe that an enlightened community, with the statute-book in their hands, needed a public lecture to teach them what it contained? If the community wish to know what the Bible teaches with respect to the destiny of our race, they must "search the Scriptures," not attend the ministry of men whose employment it is to "handle the word of God deceitfully."

Let me illustrate this point. A mariner approaches the coast of Norway. Upon his chart is laid down a whirlpool of surpassing power. Its latitude and longitude are minutely described. Some one on board the vessel suggests to the officer that he has no faith in the existence of that whirlpool; that God made the sea, as well as the land; that he is infinitely good, and would not place such a dangerous and useless gulf in the highway of nations. The unbeliever invites the officer to be liberal, and visit the whirlpool; to be candid, and take one sweep around the outer circumference. Would the invitation be accepted?

We are on a voyage. The Bible is our chart; and it points out fearful dangers. Universalism has no faith in the existence of these dangers. It urges all, who listen to its voice, to ride upon the whirlpool. 'My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not."

4. BE NOT DECEIVED BY THE REMARK THAT A DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSALISM ADVANCES THAT DELUSION.

This impression Universalists attempt to leave on the public mind. They are in raptures, at least in words, with the idea of a public discussion. But nothing do they really dread more. They confess that the prejudice against their system, in the community, arises from the public discussion of this subject. A. C. Thomas, who is as fond of this debate as any other man in the Universalist denomination, has publicly acknowledged that discussion has done great injury to Universalism.

I would make a wide distinction between a discussion of Universalism, and a debate, with a Universalist preacher, upon the truth of Universalism. This last, though repeatedly challenged, I have always declined. I have done so for several reasons. In a public debate, I must allow that my faith *may* be false, and Universalism *may* be true — a thing I do not allow. I cannot countenance the advocacy of Universalism, which I must do, if I debate the subject. I do not need to be convinced of the error of Universalism; and I want all the time that I can command, to convince others that it is false and dangerous. And then, no respectable man would condescend to employ the means and the language which Universalists employ in debate.

But the discussion of Universalism is a different matter. No preacher can be faithful to the souls of men, who has not exposed this error in a kind, *but faithful*, spirit. Bring out its sophistry, its im-

piety, its dreadful moral results, and lay them before the people. You cannot tell the amount of good that will result from the effort.

This course has never been adopted without great good. In Baltimore, Rev. Dr. Breckenridge gave to the people of that city an *exposé* of Universalism. During the process, the Universalists professed great joy at the fact that Universalism was opposed by such a mind. They predicted great good from the discussion. Mark the result in the almost total extinction of Universalism in Baltimore. What has kept that delusion from gaining ground in Philadelphia, New York, Albany, New Haven, and Hartford? I reply, faithful watchmen, who have kept the community acquainted with the real position, character, and tendency, of Universalism.

I have shown, in another place, that Universalism is astonishingly on the wane in Western New York. In no part of the country was it so prosperous a few years ago; in no section did the sect boast of such triumphs; and yet in no part of our land was it so publicly and faithfully opposed. The result is seen in its rapid decline, a decline which Universalists allow. On the other hand, find a place in which the doctrine prevails, and you find one in which, without opposition, it has been allowed to lead men captive at will. Make men familiar with the system, let them know what it is, and to what it tends, and all sober, moral men would fly from it as from the deadly fangs of the serpent, or the blighting breath of the sirocco.

5. UPON NO OCCASION RECOGNIZE THE CLAIMS OF THE TEACHERS OF UNIVERSALISM TO THE CHARACTER OF GOSPEL MINISTERS.

Universalist preachers desire nothing so much as to be recognized as Christian ministers by the religious community. This is one great motive of their labors in the temperance cause. At funerals, arrangements are sometimes made to oblige an Orthodox minister to meet a Universalist. Of all occasions in the world on which to associate with an advocate of Universalism, a funeral would seem to be the very last. Standing in the presence of God, upon the very threshold of eternity, on a business that the living will lay to heart, if they will lay any thing there, — it is no place to countenance an error which may be stained with the blood of the soul that has just left the very body about to be consigned to the grave. I beseech my brethren in the ministry not thus to sanction the claims of men who are doing such infinite mischief to the souls of their fellow-creatures.

Do you ask, What is to be done in cases in which families are divided? in cases in which you do not wish to wound the feelings of friends? I reply, The path of duty is a plain one. Say frankly that Universalism is not Christianity, that its advocates are not Christian ministers, and that those who are buried by them have not a Christian burial. If any prefer to employ such men, they have a right to do so. But you cannot sanction the proceeding. Refuse to do so from principle in one instance, and you will cease to be annoyed. If it be unpleasant to wound the feel-

over, and presented in red morocco, as when standing forth in its own repulsive garb, in the columns of the "Trumpet."

CONCLUSION.

I now close my labor, and take leave of this subject. My present position is not one of my choosing. Providence has called me to a post that I dare not desert. Neither from habit nor inclination am I a controversialist. I am fond of retirement and of peace. Universalists have labored to leave the impression that I am actuated by malice, and that on every occasion I attack them. It is not so. The sermons which I preach upon the Sabbath, have nothing in them relating to Universalism; and from them no man would know that I ever had any more to do with Universalism, than any other preacher of the gospel.

But while so much can be said upon this subject; while so many are groping for the light among Universalists, and need a friendly hand; while so many facts, all tending to throw light upon the dreadful moral tendency of Universalism, were in my possession,—I should be recreant to the interest of truth, ungrateful to that God whose Spirit has most graciously led me away from that awful delusion to which I was so blindly attached, and unfaithful to the souls of men, did I keep silence.

Universalists have betrayed their consciousness of being unable to meet the facts and arguments in these lectures, by their violent assaults upon my character. In the prosecution of my labors, I have not only been

called to meet calumny and persecution, but my public services have been disturbed, and my person exposed, by the violence of wicked men. I have been repeatedly interrupted, when preaching, by Universalist ministers. But God has been my shield and my defence.

Universalists may attempt to divert public attention from the merits of their system by the cry of persecution. But it will not avail them. They have challenged investigation, and called the religious world dishonest, because they let their doctrine alone. I have only responded to their call. They may charge me with misrepresenting their faith and their arguments. But my labor will speak for itself. And to deny the truth of my remarks in relation to the moral results of their faith, will be unwise. The more severe and startling exhibitions of the fruits of Universalism ARE FROM THE PENS OF THOSE WHO ARE STILL ENGAGED IN THE ADVOCACY OF THAT DOCTRINE.

May God bless this effort to expose error, to stay the progress of crime, and to recover those "out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will"!

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
100 Cambridge St.
Charlestown, MA 02129

3 2044 023 315 161

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does **not** exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Andover-Harvard Theological Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-5788

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve
ry collections at Harvard.